ANEKANTA
THE THIRD EYE

Acharya Mahaprajna

Jain Vishva Bharati Institute



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/anekantathirdeye0000unse

ANEKANTA
THE THIRD EYE

ANEKANTA
THE THIRD EYE

Acharya Mahaprajna

Translated by
Sudhamahi Regunathan
Vice Chancellor, Jain Vishva Bharati Institute

Jain Vishva Bharati Institute
(Deemed University)
Ladnun, Rajasthan
INDIA

© Jain Vishva Bharati Institute, 2002
First Print 2002
Reprint 2002

ISBN 81-901458-0-0

Published by Jain Vishva Bharati Institute
(Deemed University)
Ladnun, Rajasthan, INDIA
Phone: 91-01581-22110, 22230
e-mail: books@jvbi.org

Printed at Indraprastha Press (CBT)
Nehru House, 4, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg
New Delhi-110002. INDIA

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

This note has a perfect history. It begins with non-being. I did not plan to write one since my attempt all the while had been to erase or leave no proof of the hand that tried to translate. When Sadhvi Vishrut Vibha, a senior disciple of Acharya Mahaprajna, and somebody with whom I have had the good fortune to work with very closely, suggested I write this, I told her of my hesitation. The matter ended there.

The book itself was translated in the period of one month. I sent it to some editors for editing and

refining. It was then that I began to see the need for a note. The need to tell the readers that I am aware that at times they may be reminded that they are reading a translation.

Acharya Mahaprajna writes in Hindi (and Sanskrit) with great clarity. His sentences are short and his style direct. I have also observed that he only suggests, he never forces his view. He may assert his belief, but his language is conscious of relativity even in expression. He treads on ideas and counter ideas with the sensitivity of a classic Jaina monk. In sentence construction, for example, Acharyashree often resorts to passive voice. I have tried to retain it so because even if the sentence in English is not smooth to read, there comes about a subtle change of meaning if one changes it to active voice. Our concern, and now as I talk as a reader, is with the contents of what he is saying. To be able to wonder, "Does he mean it this way or that...?" To be able to use words only as line drawings and fill in the colour ourselves with the spirit that overrides the writing.

This exercise has been an ambitious attempt to capture that subtle element of, if I may coin a new word, "non-expression" in his communications.

Between one full stop and the next sentence, a kingdom can be built. And yet one sentence follows another. My attempt has been to retain this relation between space and continuity.

This book, in its original form is a compilation of daily lectures delivered by His Holiness. Very often the people he addressed were rural folk or an assortment of people from various walks of life including some unlettered ones. In this series of lectures he explains the practical applicability of the metaphysical concept of Anekanta. It is my great fortune that I was assigned the task of translating them by Acharyashree himself.

My gratitude to Sadhvi Vishrut Vibha is not something that words can contain. I think she knows and I know what I feel. She has meticulously gone through numerous corrections and taken great pains with the manuscript to bring it to the shape it is in.

I am also grateful to Ms Shriti Nath for editing my work. Her unobtrusive pencil not only worked very hard in a very short time, it was also sensitively used.

Sudhamahi Regunathan

CONTENTS

1.	Co-Existence	1
2.	Mutual Connection	24
3.	Relativity	31
4.	Third Eye (1)	77
5.	Third Eye (2)	100
6.	Independence	126
7.	Relative Estimation	148
8.	Balance	173
9.	Transformation	195
10.	Optimistic Perspective	218

PREFACE

The world, today, is well versed with concepts of relativity, equality and co-existence. The principle behind these words, the philosophical thought and wisdom that gleams through them is called anekanta (multiple nature of reality) and syadvad (the relative nature of knowledge).

Anekanta is an eye. With the two physical eyes man is able to see the gross world, but is not able to see or understand the inner world. What is the other person or nation thinking? Where, why and in what state is he thinking? What is he doing? When is he

doing what he is doing? How is he doing what he is doing? And in what state is he while saying what he is saying? Unless these factors are known, understood and evaluated, justice can neither be meted out nor can the changes that take place in the material world be understood.

The seeing eye of anekanta is the best philosophical process with which one can understand the modes or the changes, both gross and subtle, which occur in the material world. With this process, passions can be assuaged, conflicts can be resolved and the embers of rebellion can be appeased showing thus, the path to world peace.

Acharya Mahaprajna

CO-EXISTENCE

Namaskar

I salute Anekantavad for without it the world would never happen. Leave alone the pursuit of truth, even day to day transactions of society and family would not be managed without it. Anekanta is within everybody's reach and so it is the teacher of the world, the only teacher and guide. All truth and interactions are governed by it and therefore I salute it.

What is the essence?

The understanding of truth has been man's eternal quest. What is its nature? Ever since man began to think, this question has turned rhetoric in his mind: what is truth? What is reality? What is its nature? This question has been asked a million times in our philosophical tradition. Those whose intellect has awakened have definitely asked this question.

Once disciple Gautama asked Bhagvan Mahavira, "What is truth[1]?"

Mahavira replied, "To be created is the essence, creation is the truth"

A doubt crept into his mind. If to create were the truth then creation would go on endlessly. Population would multiply to such an extent that there would not even be space for the feet. Living beings would get fixed with other living beings due to lack of space, substances would merge into other substances and there would be no space for any new creation. Desire would remain desire. Desire would remain virgin. How would new creations emerge? There would be no space for them. That would be a problem.

Having thus not understood this answer

pertaining to creation, Gautama asked again, "Sire! What is truth?"

Replied Mahavira, "To be destroyed is the truth."

Once again the mind was filled with doubt. Creation is the truth and destruction is also the truth? To be created and to be destroyed, to be born and to die...what kind of meanings are these? Once born and then dead, what else is left? The answer was still unclear.

He asked yet again, "Sire, What is truth?"

Bhagvan answered, "To be eternal is the truth."

Gautama's mind now focused itself. To be created, destroyed and to remain in existence this is the three-fold truth. Creation, destruction and existence, make truth. Truth is the conflict between the eternal and the impermanent. Just as man and woman make a pair, eternity and impermanence make a pair in nature. There is no absolute permanence or absolute impermanence. The eternal and the impermanent are conflicting opposites. This is truth. In the world around us, if there had been only absolute permanence, then its nomenclature would not have been possible. How could it have been named? Since there is permanence that is why

we understand impermanence and similarly since there is impermanence, we understand permanence. But if there were only absolute permanence or absolute impermanence, then their nomenclature would have been difficult. If there was only light and no darkness, then light could not have been defined. All the names that are coined are done so on the basis of their opposites. The need for an opposition party is not just a political concept. The existence of opposites is a fundamental principle. It forms the grammar of all existence and of all truth for if there were no opposites, there would be no truth. That there is truth means that there exists an opposing truth too. The existence of consciousness is defined by the unconscious and the existence of the unconscious by the conscious. The unconscious without the conscious and the conscious without the unconscious cannot exist. It is compulsory for both to exist.

The rule of Anekanta

Anekanta has one rule: co-existence of opposites. Not only is existence in pairs, they have to be opposing pairs. In the entire world of nature, in the

entire universe of existence, opposing pairs exist. If there is wisdom there is ignorance. If there is vision, there is lack of it. If there is happiness then there is sadness too. If there is loss of consciousness, there is awakening . If there is death, there is life. There is the auspicious and the inauspicious. High and low. The disturbed and the undisturbed. There is gaining of strength and the loss of it. Opposing pairs define Karmasastra (the philosophy of karma).

Our life is based on opposing pairs. If the opposition between the pairs was to disappear, so would life. According to Hatha Yoga, life is defined as the combination of inhalation and exhalation. There are five types of *pranas*[2]. Of them one is *prana* and the other is *apana. Prana* is an energy that flows in the frontal part of the body with its vibrations reaching the navel. *Apana* moves along the back of the body. As long as the opposing directions are maintained there is life. When this order is broken, life is broken. The breaking of life, or death means the expulsion of both these energies. When opposing movements, or when the two directional movements become one, life comes to an end.

Two centers

There are two centers in the body: the *gyan kendra* or the center of wisdom and the *kam kendra* or the center of passion. Both of them are opposites. The center of passion weighs down the consciousness. The center of wisdom raises the level of the consciousness. One is upward moving and the other is downward moving. The up and down movement of the consciousness is in opposition to each other. Life rests on these two movements.

The language of science

In science these two centers are referred to as glands. One is the pineal-pituitary gland and the other the gonads. The pineal and the pituitary are centers that promote wisdom. Gonads promote passions. Our consciousness depends on the functioning of the pineal and the pituitary. When the secretions of the pineal and pituitary reach the gonads then passions are inflamed. But when these secretions change, then the action of the hypothalamus changes and there begins the growth of wisdom.

Both the opposing themes are built into our

physical system. Both the glands perform their respective functions. The action of both the glands are in opposition and capable of reversing that of the other. Opposing forces are acting in the creation of the body, in the creation of nature, in the creation of the atom or in that of electricity. They function simultaneously. In the world of electricity, both the negative and the positive work together. If there were only the positive and no negative, then no electricity would be produced. It is compulsory for both the positive and the negative to exist for electricity to be produced. The positive and the negative are two types of energies.

Opposing pairs

Our entire existence is then characterized by opposing pairs. The attribute and its opposition are both necessary. Either of them by itself is of no use. Their combination makes for success.

On the basis of anekanta it has been found that if there is the world[3], there is also the anti-world. This is a strange situation. The vision of the world or our life system is got from many philosophies but that of anti-world is found only in the world of anekanta.

In other philosophies this vision is not found. Contemporary scientists have indeed given this vision a form. In ancient philosophies the world has been visualized in many ways. But anti-world has not been discussed anywhere.

Contemporary science tells us that if there is a universe, there has to be an anti-universe too. If there is a particle, there has to be an anti-particle too. If there is an atom, there is an anti-atom too. If there is substance, there is anti-substance too. If there is a world there is an anti-world too. If there is matter, there is anti-matter too. If there were no anti-matter then matter would have no existence. If there were no anti-particle then there would be no particle, and if there were no anti-world then the world would have no existence.

When Jain philosophy defined anti-world then the question about its nature arose. The world can be understood because it is visible, but the anti-world is not visible. How then does one accept it? A very difficult question. To obtain the answer to this question it became necessary to employ the concept of anekanta. Anekanta says there are two principles: *gati* (pace) and *sthithi* (rest). There is neither

absolute motion nor absolute rest. Both exist together. Where the rule of motion and rest does not come into play that is the anti-world. Where the sentient and the insentient exist, that is the world. Where there is no union of the sentient and the insentient, where the insentient rests alone where there is only the cosmos[4] and no other substance attached to it, there you find the anti-world.

Thesis and anti-thesis

Every object is connected to its opposite object. In the quest for anti-particles, scientists have used micro-instruments as tools. A micro-instrument was invented which could measure the subtle changes taking place in the 15th billion part of one second. Then the anti-particle was found. Today it is more than established that without the anti-particle, the particle would have no existence. It is mandatory for both to exist. The basic principle of anekanta is the acceptance of the existence of opposites, the acceptance of opposition. Anekanta is built on this. Anekanta says, do not look at truth from one angle only. If you look at truth from the perspective of existence, then look at it from the perspective of non-

existence too. Acceptance and non-acceptance go side by side. One perspective alone will not do. All our activities in life and society are built on the bricks of opposing principles. If these opposing bricks were not there, there would be no activity, no civilization. There are opposing desires, opposing aspirations and opposing conducts. If one man thinks in a certain way, another thinks in another way, an entirely opposite way. If one man looks at a certain proposition as gainful another may look at the same thing as a losing one. If one thinks of it as useful, another may think of it as totally useless. A single object invites many different kinds of thoughts. This is natural. There is nothing unnatural about this.

Opposing benefits

There was once a potter. He had two daughters. One was married into a family of farmers and another into a family of potters. Both were happy. One day the potter went to meet his daughters. Both of them were in the same village. He arrived at the house of the girl married into the farmer's family. He exchanged greetings and on seeing the daughter unhappy asked, "Child, why are you sad?" The

daughter replied, "Father, it is time to go to the fields. But it is not raining. Nowhere in the sky can I see clouds. It will be a great problem if it does not rain. This worry is tormenting me. If it rains soon, it will be good. Please pray to the Lord for rains."

The potter then left for his second daughter's house. Greetings were exchanged. The daughter said, "Father all the rest is well, but it is the rainy season now. The pots are in the kiln. If it rains they will all crumble and become mud. Father please pray to the Lord that it does not rain now. Not now. Not till our pots are baked."

The potter wondered, "Should I pray for rain or no rain? Both my daughters have presented two opposing interests. To one rain will be beneficial, to another it will not be so."

This world is full of opposing qualities. Each one's personal desires are different. That which is beneficial to a mill owner is different from that which is beneficial to a labourer. Different things benefit a boss and different things are beneficial to his servant or employee. There is conflict between the beneficial aspects of both. This is not a conflict that will end, though attempts are being made to resolve it. But

then how will it be resolved? This conflict is built into our very nature. It is intertwined with the very structure of our lives. So how can it be resolved? Sociologists have termed this the struggle for survival...in life conflict is inevitable. Conflict indicates development. If there were no embers, there would be no hope of light or of development. When the embers burn then there is light. How to put an end to this conflict? It is a very grave question concerning opposing benefits and opposing personal interests. The whole world is filled with the conflict of opposing benefits. There is no averaging out between two people's benefits. A bachelor thinks that if everybody became celibate, it would be good. Some wonder how creation would continue if everybody became celibate? Both their thoughts are in opposition to each other. If, for example, somebody wanted to be initiated into monkhood, there would be some who would wonder what would happen if everybody got initiated into monkhood.

The following event took place. A young man wanted to become a monk. On hearing of his desire, the whole village rose in protest. Those who knew him also protested, those who did not know him

also protested. Every person wished that the young man would get married and have children. When one finds that even one person is breaking the order of creation and going a different way, then it seems that the whole process of creation itself is in danger. Opposing benefits clash. The conflict between following an ascetic's life and a householder's life has been going on for a long time now. The conflict between truth and lies has been continual for a long time now. The man who speaks the truth always wishes nobody would tell lies. And the one who tells lies never wishes that anybody speak the truth. A thief will, forever, try to make everybody steal and not let anyone become a merchant, for in the former lies his mental comfort.

Nobody would have a nose

Listen to this story. There was once a man without a nose. People used to think of him as inauspicious. He was very sad. He was intelligent and so thought of doing something by which the whole world would become "nose-less". Then this idea of inauspicious and auspicious, good omen and bad omen would all come to an end. So one day he went to the market

and looked upwards. People asked him what he was seeing. He exclaimed, "Look God Himself is appearing before me." This news spread across the village. A crowd began to gather. They looked upwards and said, "Where is God? We are not able to see anything." He replied, "I am able to see the Lord Himself. How can you see him? Your nose is obstructing your vision. As long as your nose protrudes, you will not be able to behold this sight. I do not have a nose and so I have no protrusion that will block my vision. That is why I am able to behold the Lord clearly."

People fell into a quandary. One man asked, "How can the nose bridge become a barrier?" Another replied, "Well you do not understand, but what he is saying is true. If you want to behold the Lord then chop off your nose. In just two seconds, God will appear in full form."

There is never a shortage of fools in the world. If there are wise men, then it is necessary to find foolish ones too.

One man went to a barber to chop off his nose. The barber said, "Are you stupid? How does the nose obstruct sight?" He replied, "You do not know this

principle. Here take the money and chop of my nose. I am very keen to see the Lord."

The barber cut off his nose.

He came running to the man without a nose and asked, "Now tell me where to look." The man without a nose said, "Look above." He looked above and said, "But... I am not able to see anything." The man without a nose said, "Hush, keep quiet. Say you are able to behold the Lord. If you do not say that then you too will become inauspicious. Nobody will respect you. They will call you names. If, however, you say that you are able to see God then thousands of men will cut off their nose and fall within our category." The second man understood the secret. He said aloud, "Wow! What a beautiful sight! The Lord Himself has appeared before me." He started dancing. Now from one there were two men who did not have a nose. Even as they were dancing, their numbers multiplied to thousands.

The search for co-existence

This whole world works like that. Every person wishes that the other person speak the way he speaks. That other people walk as he does. That they wear

clothes the same way as he does. That everybody behaves and lives as he does. This is a universal desire. But it does not happen that way. There are contradictory tastes. Contradictory natures and thoughts.

Contradictory temperament and contradictory habits. Clashes, conflicts and fights are a result of all this. Initially they are born in the form of seeds. Over time as they grow they become major wars. The fight of one or two men leads to world wars. Major wars are never fought for anything big. Their root is very small, insignificant. One will never find any major reason for great wars. They have all been fought for very small reasons. For a small piece of land, great wars have been fought. To rescue the wife, great wars have been fought. A small insult has resulted in a great war. Is this world only for wars? Will man forever be fighting? Will he keep superimposing his beliefs and likes on others? Is there any third path other than these two? Is there any such path on which we can follow a conflict-free life in spite of living in a world of conflicts? In spite of living between many differences, can we live a life of unity? To contain this constantly recurring question anekanta has found a path. The path is that of co-existence.

Co-existence: the norm of nature

Co-existence is given a lot of weightage in today's politics. The principle of co-existence is held aloft. Co-existence between all the different ways of life is absolutely essential. One stream of thought is based on socialist principles while the other on capitalist principles. If one is the dictate of democracy, the other is that of autocracy. Both the streams of thought are well known in the world today. They are opposing thoughts. In such a situation the ideal outcome should be that either the socialist remains or the capitalist, either democracy or autocracy. Both cannot exist because they are contradictory. Either you or me...not both together.

If one continues to think like this: either socialism or capitalism; either democracy or autocracy then there will be no alternative left but to wage wars. In the political arena it has been concluded that emphasis should be placed on co-existence. Both can co-exist, both can live. They both have the right to do so. On the basis of this co-existence, institutions like the United Nations have the representation of both socialist and capitalist countries. Even though the idea of accommodating co-existence in politics

is something new, in the laws of nature the idea of co-existence is found all the time. It is nothing new. To make and to unmake, to do and undo, this is an age-old process.

In our body there are billions of cells. Every second, five crore cells are being destroyed and a new five crore are being created. This co-existence is continual. To be born and to die, to be and not be. If the cells did not die, then the body would. If new cells were not created, then the body would break. When both the activities co-exist, then the body lives on.

Life and death are contradictions and yet they come together and move on together. The same second in which a man lives, he is dying and in the very same second in which he dies, he continues to live. The two contradictory events of life and death co-exist. There is no definite time schedule that at a certain time man lives and at a certain time, he dies. The two activities go on together. The second which is life-giving is also the same second which is death-producing. Similarly the second which is death-producing is also the same one which is life-giving. The two cannot be separated.

Co-existence is a self-created norm

It is natural to have contradictions. The existence of opposing pairs is intrinsic to nature. Their co-existence is also intrinsic to nature, it is natural. Nobody laid this norm, it is self-created. No great man, sage or seer makes norms. He gives explanations for the norms. He uncovers the secrets embedded in the norms. Nobody can create norms for nature. Man can lay down the rules of conduct, rules for eating habits, but however powerful or wise he may be, he cannot create the rules of nature. Nature's norms are natural, distinguishing.

The rule of co-existence is also distinguishing. This dualistic world and the co-existence of opposites are nature's laws. Even the simultaneous presence of opposing beliefs, their co-existence is nature's law. The first ever explanation of this rule was done by anekanta. If Indian, as well as other philosophies of the world were to be ranked historically in order of their explanation of co-existence, anekanta would take the first place. The basis of anekanta itself was formed by the observation that the nature of matter itself is such that opposing forces reside within it. How, then can we look at matter from a single

dimensional viewpoint? From one single viewpoint how can we explain life or truth? It is then easily derived that in accordance with the nature of matter or truth, we too look at it from different perspectives. That we should look at truth from different perspectives. When the nature of matter itself is like that then how can we change it? In nature there is no reason. Reason is used in man-made situations. In the field of intrinsic nature, reason can play no role.

When man is able to understand co-existence, when it becomes easy to explain life and truth, then life and truth are given one single language. The desire to erase opposition comes to an end.

One object: many forms

Anekanta and *Ahimsa*[5] are not two different things. Anekanta and *Maitri*[6] are not two different things. If there is no anekanta, then *ahimsa* cannot be developed. If there is no anekanta then *maitri* cannot be developed. Without anekanta passions cannot be sublimated. When a man looks at an object with attachment, it presents itself to him in a certain manner and the same object looks different when he

looks at it with hatred. The object is one, but with attachment or aversion, its form changes.

There is an interesting passage.

Rama asked Hanuman, "How were the flowers in Asoka vatika?" Hanuman replied, "They were red in colour."

"On the contrary." said Sita, "all the flowers were white. There was not even a single red flower." Same place, same time, same garden, but two different versions. How can we call one the untruth? Explained Rama, "Hanuman was then in rage. His eyes bled blood. At that time every corner of Asoka garden appeared red to him. It is not surprising. Sita was tranquil. She saw everything white. The colour white indicates peace."

The heartiness of anekanta.

In life many opposing problems arise. Their solution can be found only in anekanta. If our view is anekantic and we look at opposing views from varying angles, then we can find the solution. But conflict becomes inevitable if we do not look at truth from a truthful perspective, and at reality from a realistic perspective or the two opposing

truths from two different perspectives. In such a situation, no reconciliation is possible. One single perspective does not harness all truths. The best and sure way of avoiding conflict is to recognize that in the affairs of the world conflicting pairs are always at work. Along with that, it is also essential to understand that these opposing pairs work simultaneously, they co-exist. Winter and summer co-exist. The cycle of seasons works. After winter comes summer and after summer comes winter. This is an exception. And yet the two, summer and winter co-exist. What we think of as summer is also winter and what we think of as winter is also summer. It is a different situation when light comes after dark and dark after light. Similarly the coming of day after night and night after day is another question. According to anekanta the day and night move together. Darkness and light exist together. In this hall, small print cannot be read. The one who tries to read them will feel the hall is dark. I ask "Where is darkness? I am seeing you, you are seeing me. All the objects of the room are visible. Without light they would not be visible. There is light here." But there is not that much light as is

required to read small print and so it is said that the room is dark. Light and darkness co-exist. Both are relative. They cannot be separated.

Symbiotic support

If we all understand this co-existence then there would be no need for conflict. There is an important dictum in the Tatvartha sutra: *Parasparoupagraho jeevanam*...life means supporting each other...this is nature's law, the unchangeable rule of creation. There is no conflict in the fact that one gets the support of another. Conflict grew because the concept of co-existence was forgotten. Opposing pairs can live together...when this rule does not meet the eye, conflicts grow. Man is able to look at things with only one perspective.

Sociologists have said that struggle is necessary for life because they did not understand the concept of the co-existence of opposing pairs or the principle of the other side. Those who understood the idea of co-existence of opposing pairs benefited from the heartiness of the vision of anekanta and announced the finding of eternal value: that each living being is a support to the other. One object becomes a

support to another. Conflict is not the rule of nature; it has been planted there.

Notes

1. The word used in the original is *tatva.*
2. In Hatha Yoga *prana* is referred to the vital force that moves in the anterior part of the body while *apana* is the vital energy that moves in the posterior part of the body.
3. The word used is *loka* for world and *aloka* for anti-world.
4. *Akash* has been translated as cosmos
5. *Ahimsa* may be translated as Not-violence
6. *Maitri* may be translated as amity

MUTUAL CONNECTION

Co-existence of opposing pairs

It is in the nature of objects to find opposing pairs within them. It is also in their nature to discover that the opposing pairs co-exist. The question is how to accept this as a distinct possibility. Two opposing qualities co-existing in the same single object...how is that possible? It is a difficult problem. And yet there is no problem within the object. In this world there is nothing that is always in opposition, always in different stances or in variation. It is an important find of anekanta that no element is always alike or

always different. They are not always similar nor are they always dissimilar. That which we think is alike and similar has points of differences as well as dissimilarities. That which we think is different is similar also. We announce our conclusion of similarity and dissimilarity, likeness and otherwise, difference or otherwise on the basis of gross appearances. But when we enter the world of the subtle, consider and practice the rules of knowing the subtle, we realize our thinking is not all true. All our rules change there. Our thinking is based on the gross manifested properties of the object. When the world of the *avyakt* or the unmanifested modes opens before us, when the world of the unknown becomes known to us, then we begin to understand the rules governing the world of the subtle and all our thoughts based on the gross world begin to change.

All three are one

Take light, word and colour...these are three. We believe light to be different, word to be different and colour to be different. But no scientist thinks of them so. Word is sound and colour is the hue[1]. Both are waves or vibrations of light which are formed at

different frequencies and are manifested in the form of light, colour or sound. Colour is light wave of frequency number 49. Sound too is a light wave of a different frequency. Colour and sound are thus not different. Colours can be heard and sound can be seen. The instrument to hear colour is called aurotrol. By adjusting its frequencies we can begin to see sound and hear colour. These objects that seem so different from each other now become the same. Our senses are receptive to different things. The eyes see, the ears listen, the nose smells, the tongue tastes and the skin feels touch. This is a very gross division. If we look at it from its subtler aspects then the work of the eye would be not just to see but also to listen, to smell and even to taste. The tongue cannot just taste it can listen too.

Kashyap Kaumarbhritya

Acharya Kashyap Kaumarbhritya was a well-known Ayurvedic doctor. He has written: "Just as we have two hands, we have two tongues also. It is divided into two parts. One part of the tongue tastes and the other, listens. He says the ears do not listen. It only receives sound, it is receptive. It is the tool

for the reception of sound. It receives the sound and transmits it to the tongue. In actuality it is only the tongue which hears. To prove his contention he advances the following argument: One man is deaf. It is not necessary that the deaf man be dumb too. But one who is dumb is necessarily deaf also. The one who cannot talk with his tongue is dumb and the one who cannot hear with his ears is deaf. The one who is deaf may still be able to speak but the one who is dumb is neither able to speak nor hear. The one, whose tongue is not functioning, is dumb and he definitely cannot hear either. This is an unchanging rule." The Acharya said: "The dumb man is deaf because his tongue is defective and he is not able to hear. The ear is functioning well, it receives the sound and transmits it to the tongue, but the tongue is not able to catch it and so the man is unable to hear. So it is inevitable that a dumb man is deaf. The tongue of the man who is not dumb has the power to hear. His ear, however, is defective. So the ear is not able to grasp the transmissions of the tongue. That is why he is not able to hear. Today's physiologists also say that the power of hearing is greater in the teeth bones than in the ear.

In comparison to the ears, the teeth hear better. Today attempts are being made to completely eradicate deafness. A machine will be fixed on the teeth bones and the deaf man will be able to hear. The tongue can hear. That the teeth hear means getting quite close to that.

Sambhinnasrotolabdhi

Jain Acharyas had proven even more advanced facts. They have described a yogic method of super natural powers. It is called Sambhinnasrotolabdhi. It is an excellent power by means of which the whole body becomes a sensory organ, an instrument. Then all this talk of the eyes seeing and the ears hearing becomes meaningless. With the manifestation of this power, every limb of the body works as the five sensory organs. The whole body can see, the whole body can hear. Some people read with their fingers...they perform the work of the eyes with their fingers. This phenomenon has bewildered many scientists. They cannot deny the obvious. They cannot say that one cannot read with the fingers. And yet they are not able to explain how and why it is being done so. This topic is still beyond science

and scientists are still trying to understand it. But this concept has been accepted many centuries ago that the whole body performs the activity of the sense organs. One sensory organ can perform the job of another or we can say that the whole body may be used as a sensory organ.

Expressed: Unexpressed

Differences in manifested expressions or those differences that appear on the surface disappear when one looks deeper into the matter or look for the more subtle principles. When the vision is deep then all the rules break. The rules of the manifest world are always different from those of the unexpressed, un-manifested world. The difficulty facing us is that we want to define the unmanifested through the manifested as also define the manifested through the manifested itself. What we forget or do not accept is that this world is a very small one; it is a world of waves. But we never care to look at the large ocean of truth that lies beneath these waves. We base all our understanding of truth purely on the basis of the expressed, manifested world. Anekanta cautions against this. Do not give in to

the arrogance of seeking complete truth on the basis of the manifested alone.

Man lives by what he sees and he frames his thoughts on the basis of whatever is expressed within the limits of the perceptions of the present. The self gets attached and he says this is mine. How did you accept that this is yours? Is it the truth? How can it be said that a certain thing is mine? That, which I declare as mine, is my enemy. That which I do not think of as mine is my friend. That which I think is mine has an enemy hidden within it and that which I think is not mine has a friend hidden within it. I am not able to see either of them.

Perverted vision

Man has made two categories: one is a category of friends and loved ones and the second category is of others, outsiders, enemies. From time immemorial man is being fooled. And he gets fooled more by his own people than by those he considers as not his own. Man continues to rely on the gross manifested world reposing no faith in subtle perceptions. The one who is good in the present is termed a friend and the one who is not good is termed an enemy.

Though in actuality the one who says the sweet words of a friend may also do the harm of an enemy. Parents tell the son, do not take alcohol, keep a distance from intoxicants, do not get into bad habits and do not mix with an undesirable crowd. The son thinks his parents are his enemies. Instead the one who says let us go to the nightclub, drink and have fun seems to be a better friend. This is perversion of vision.

Causes of change in vision

Anekanta is a well-known principle of life. This principle begins with a change of vision. When our vision is not holistic then our thoughts are not distilled through both the gross and the subtle world. As long as our knowledge is not a synthesis of the expressed and the unexpressed modes we are not able to take the right decisions and are also not able to save ourselves from problems. The nature of matter is a very big truth. We should not make light of it. We should try to understand it. No man who has flouted the norms that govern matter has been able to live happily. Only he who accepts the real facts and the laws that govern matter, will be able to

lead a life of peace and happiness, not the one who with his deliberated arguments tries to avoid facing the truth. In general, man does not want to change but in an attempt to make his goals accessible, he brings them down a peg or two. No man wants to reach the level of God and yet he wants to bring God down to earth, to his level. This is perversion. This perspective is wrong. If we are able to change this perspective and if we accept truth as undivided and eternal then there will be no place for sorrow.

The greatest rule of truth is that nothing on earth is forever the same or forever different.

Nobody is forever an enemy nor is anybody forever a friend. On the basis of this rule we can proceed with our exploration. We then access the royal highway of life. The highway which also shows the way to meditational practice. The highway which enables us to be able to see the thief in the trader and the trader in the thief. Who is the thief and who is the trader?

There is an interesting passage. Jesus told the crowd: "Only the man who is pure and has never been perverted can stone this lady." Nobody's hand rose. The words of Jesus made everybody ashamed,

made him or her look at the thief within them, at the Satan hidden within them. Nobody's hand rose to throw a stone. Everybody was left stunned.

The success of Anekanta

If we are able to recognize the thief and the trader hidden within us (where the thief represents stealth and the trader, fair dealings) and if we are able to put the thief to sleep and awaken the trader, then we can successfully bring anekanta to influence our lives. That is why meditation and spiritual practice are going on. We are involved in this. Without meditation the path of anekanta would not be clear. We meditate so that the facts that are not manifest may become explicit, so as to awaken the dormant trader and to express the unseen facts; to put to sleep the thief, to bring about a change in priorities and hide that which is now prominent and make the hidden, prominent. To displace the person seated on a chair and seat him on the ground and to seat the person from the ground, on the chair.

An advertisement said that a company had some vacancies and that interested persons should apply in person. Many aspirants came. The manager asked

them what they wanted to become. One of them said, "I want to be a peon." The other said, "I want to be a clerk." "I want to be a supervisor or an engineer," said some others. Everybody was placed in the comparable positions. One aspirant remained. He was asked what he wanted to become. He replied that he wanted to be the manager. "I want to sit on that chair of yours." What a major aspiration! And it was fulfilled. He became the manager.

The rule for success: acceptance of possibilities

There are infinite modes. Within us a lot of potential possibilities are hidden. Coal can turn into diamond. Today this is a definite fact that coal can become a diamond. The potential to become a diamond is latent within coal. Every thing has the ability to become anything. This is the belief of anekanta. Few things are impossible. Sentience cannot become insentience and insentience cannot become sentience. Other than this everything else is possible. There is no rule which prevents change from one to another or from becoming another. One can become anything and everything. All the possibilities are there. In one small grain of sand all

its properties of smell, colour and touch are there. One particle of sand is infinitely sweeter than one particle of sugar.

We are engaged in meditation only with the acceptance of possibilities. Within us there is infinite consciousness, infinite knowledge. There is enlightenment (*kevallya*) within us. We have infinite strength within us, infinite bliss. Acknowledging the possibility of manifesting all this, we perform our special meditation. If these possibilities did not exist then who would spend so much time on them? Who would withstand such trouble and, in spite of being a sensory being, give up all the pleasures of the senses? If we sit huddled away from the world spending five to six hours in meditation and *kayotsarg*, it is only because we know these possibilities. They are known. It is also known that from the above means they can become manifest.

Illness is a condition[2]. It manifests and man becomes ill. To be healthy or ill is a condition. It is within us. Its possibilities are there. With its manifestation, disease disappears. We have infinite possibilities of good health within us. With their expression, disease disappears.

Man becomes disappointed because he does not know the rules of anekanta. He forgets that no condition is permanent. Each condition keeps changing. If the condition of disease is presenting itself, we can turn it into a condition of health with our effort. If today the condition of sorrow is being manifested, then tomorrow it can be the condition of joy. One, who has the ability to accept this possibility will never face sorrow, will never fall ill. He will never spend his life in bed. He will awaken his dormant energy.

There is a story in Sanskrit literature. A learned man came and told the king, "Your majesty, accept my greetings. I have come as your guest." The king said, "Who invited you? Who invited such a tattered looking man?" The man said, "Your majesty, I am your brother. Why do I need an invitation?" The king was shocked. "How are you my brother? You are a fool. You are mad." The man replied, "Your majesty, you have not recognized me. I am a cousin on your maternal side, not your brother." The king said he did not understand. The man said,

Apada ca mama mata, tave mata ca sampada
Apat sampada bhaginyau tenaham tava bandhavah

"Your majesty! My mother's name is misfortune and your mother's name is fortune. Both misfortune and fortune are sisters. I am your mother's sister's son. Sir, I am your cousin."

The king was extremely pleased with what the Brahmin had said and gave him many gifts and embraced him as one would a brother.

Anekanta is life's philosophy

Nothing is independent. Everything is connected. Always a difference or always a similarity, always opposition or always syncronization, always one's own or always somebody else's...these are all just illusions, not reality. If we want to live in reality then we have to develop the anekantic view in our practical life. The biggest mistake is that we have mistaken anekanta for philosophy. That only in discussions of truth does one use anekanta. This is a mistaken belief. That explanation which does not apply to real life does not apply to the quest for truth either. Life is also a truth. It is a great truth and all explanations derive from it. All principles, streams of thought and arguments originate from it. No truth or discussion can be located away from life.

The principle that does not have any link with life does not have validity anywhere. "*Yatha pinde tatha brahmande*" The one who gave this dictum gave something very significant. That much truth as is contained in a small particle is contained in the whole universe. All the truth that is contained in the universe is contained in a small particle.

Our life is indeed very extraordinary and so is our body. How many infinite truths are hidden within our body! From the gross viewpoint we see this as our leg or eye. In reality are they two? If in reality they were two different parts then the Ayurved Acharya's contention that when the eye hurts rub balm over the foot to heal it, would be proved wrong. How strange is this link and yet it is not separated from reality. Just as there are eyes on the face, there are eyes on the foot too. If the pituitary gland is located between the eyebrows, it is also located on the big toe. There are just as many glands or organs in the upper part of the body as there are in the lower part. Today science has established that. The whole body is a connected one. It is based on this principle that we have acupuncture and acupressure. The entire body is interconnected. The

leg hurts, press the backbone and the pain will disappear. Press the big toe and headache will disappear. There is a method of applying pressure and that has to be learnt.

Dualism and non-dualism

There is mutual connection between everything. Nothing is totally independent. Though from the outside things may look separate, from inside they are all inter-connected. We do not know the unity underlying the diversity. Similarly we do not know the multiplicity that lies beneath unity. Our perceptions are divided. Therefore it is that even in philosophy if non-dualism developed so did dualism along with it. One contention was that everything is one, there is nothing different from that one, complete monoism. Even monoism is of two kinds. One is the argument of the Caravakas and one of the Vedantics. One feels there is the insentient only and not the sentient. From the insentient, the sentient develops. An atheist believes that the sentient is not real. The root principle is that of the insentient. Only atoms, only matter. From that the sentient is born. The composition of the insentient is such that from

it is born the sentient. This is core-monoism or insentient monoism.

The other philosophy says there is the sentient but not the insentient. From the sentient the insentient is born. This is Brahma-monoism or the sentient monoism.

Both the philosophies are two extremes. One is hinged on the sentient and the other on the insentient.

Not always in inconsistency nor always in consistency

Anekanta looked for the middle path between these two and laid down the third rule to say that there is no eternal conflict or synchrony between the sentient and the insentient. We cannot say that the insentient and the sentient are always in opposition to each other. If that were true and they were always in opposition, then the soul and the body would not be one, they would be separate. The body and the soul are one because the opposition between the two is not constant. Many a time the question that crops up in the world of philosophy is that how did the incorporeal soul combine with the corporeal body? How does the incorporeal soul relate to

corporeal karmas? How come the conscious soul combines with the material body? If we think of the two as constantly in opposition, then we would never be able to answer the question. If we however accept the possibility that the two are not constantly in opposition then we can come up with answers. If they were in constant opposition, they would not be able to be together at all.

The son said, "Father! I will not dine with you from now on. I want to be a separate entity." The father said, "No problem. Till now you were dining with me. Today I will dine with you."

Similar is the relation between the sentient and the insentient. They are never separate, they are always together. They make use of each other fully. The sentient is making use of the insentient and the insentient of the sentient. The sentient holds on to the insentient and the insentient to the sentient. The rule is that the conflict between the two is never total. The dissimilarity between the two is also not total. There is a similarity also between the two. All the attributes of objects are complementary to each other. Only modes differ. When we look at the world in terms of the differing modes then all we see is

difference, difference and more, difference. When we see the unexpressed modes then we can see only the similarity, similarity, and more similarity.

Our living world has clarity. Within it we see only the differences: the plant world, the organisms with single sense organs, those with two sense organs, those with three sense organs, with four, five sense organs, animals, man and so on. If we however begin to see the unexpressed modes then all these divisions will go awry, will not exist. All that will remain will be the consciousness. It is equal in all living beings, be it a plant, an insect, man or animal. Only the consciousness remains, the consciousness. All other distinctions fall off. Only one remains and that is the consciousness. Difference and similarity, opposition and harmony, these are all divisions based on the mode of the object. In an object both contrary attributes co-exist. Opposition and harmony, existence and non-existence, reality and unreality, eternal and temporary...these pairs co-exist. The difference is in the modes of the object and in our vision. We see the objects in the gross form and base our divisions thereof. It is worth reiterating that all our decisions, beliefs, thinking

and principles are based on the observations of the gross modes of the world. We should not mistake them for eternal rules, for rules governing reality, for the rules for the world of the subtle.

Transcendental and Pragmatic (Nischay and Vyavahar)

Anekanta has defined both the subtle and the gross and presented their respective perspectives. The two perspectives are the *nischay naya* or the transcendental perspective and the *vyavahar naya* or the pragmatic perspective. To know the subtle truths the *nischay naya* helps and to know the gross truths, *vyavahara naya* helps. When both these perspectives are relative, mutually connected, then we arrive at the conclusion that similarity and dissimilarity are not independent but mutually connected. A whole thinking based on mutual connection is then opened to us. It is on the basis of this mutual connection that Jain seers of medieval times have done a great deal of work and with every philosophy have shown the path of concord.

One Jain seer has written that there is no difference between soul and matter. The difference is only in

one attribute. The soul is the sentient and the body is not. Both the soul and the body have infinite attributes. Amongst all these attributes the difference lies only in one: that the soul is the sentient and the body is not. This is a very significant observation. Indeed when all but one attribute are similar then, there is large similarity. The difference is created by a single attribute.

The experience of similarity

Attributes are of two kinds: *samanya* that is common and *vishesh* that is specific. The common attribute is found in the same manner everywhere, in the sentient as well as the insentient. The souls, being sentient are intangible and, matter, in spite of being the insentient is also intangible. The medium of motion (*dharma astikaya*) and the medium of rest (*adharma astikaya*) represent the insentient and the intangible. From this perspective then, the intangible soul and insentient ether are similar. Both are matterless and incorporeal. *Dharma astikaya* is a substance but not corporeal, it is incorporeal. Many a time we say that the soul is not corporeal. But is *dharma astikaya* not incorporeal? There is a

lot of similarity between the two. More similarities and fewer differences. The one who looks at the gross fact modes forgets the similarities and clings to the differences. That is why there are arguments, diverse traditions and conflicts. They take place on the basis of the gross modes of the object. In the outer world, similarities are few and difference many, while in the inner world differences are few and similarities more. Through meditation we want to develop our inner world so that our visions become so wise and blemishless that we are able to see the commonalities beneath the differences.

Kabir's son Kamaal went to the forest to cut grass. He did not come home till late evening. Kabir got worried. The father reached the forest searching for his son. He saw Kamaal standing immobile like a stupid fellow. He was looking at the grass but not cutting it. Kabir scolded him. "What are you doing? Can you not see that the sun has set? You have not cut any grass?" Answered Kamaal, "How do I cut? Do I cut myself? Just as my breath keeps life within me, there is a breath running within these blades of grass too. Now how do I cut? Whom do I cut?" Now Kamaal became incapable of cutting grass.

Mahavir expressed the experience of similarity in the following way: *Tumamsi nama sachcheva jamhamtavam ti mannasi*

"Man! The one who you want to kill is you yourself." In this context, the following sentences of his experience of equality is significant:

Tumamsi nama sachcheva jam
ajjaveyavvam ti mannasi
(The one, who you think is fit to be at your command, he is you indeed)
Tumamsi nama vachcheva jam
partaveyavvam ti mannasi
(The one, who you think fit to punish, he is you indeed.)
Tumamsi nama vachcheva jam
pariddhetavvam ti mannasi
(The one, who you think is fit to enslave, he is you indeed.)
Tumamsi nama vachcheva jam
udveyavvam ti mannasi
(The one, who you think is fit to be killed, he is you indeed.)

The realization of this highest truth has been on the basis of anekanta. Only he can accept anekanta who is free from attachments and aversions. The one who has excessive attachments and aversions will never accept anekanta. Indeed anekanta is the philosophy of meditation, the philosophy of spiritual practice. The one in whom the sentient is free from passions, is blemishless, in him the vision of anekanta will rise, the wisdom of truth dawns, not in anybody else.

From the perception of breathing to perception of the soul

An important sutra or aphorism of *Preksha dhyan* is: *Sampikkhaye appagamappyenam* : see your soul through your soul. The first step of meditation is: perceiving the breath. The question then is: is the soul the breath? Yes indeed, the breath is the soul, the body is also the soul, the mind and speech are also the soul, and the subtle body and the karmic body are also the soul. The reason for this is that they are all attached to the soul. The light rays of the soul reach the breath, the body and the subtle body, the mind and speech. The breath is operated

with vital energy. Through vital energy, it becomes the sentient. The one who is not able to grasp the sentience of the breath, how will he reach the soul? The one who is not alert to his own breath, how will he be alert to his soul? The breath is a part of sentience. The one who awakens to it will progress ahead till he reaches the soul. The one who does not awaken to his breath does not gain the right to go inwards.

We have raised many walls. They should all break. If our vision could change then anything is possible.

There were two brothers. The house was big. There was a lot of love between the brothers, but with time, the love waned. It is the nature of love that in the beginning it is very much and with time it grows less.

A couple fought everyday. One day the neighbours gathered around. One wise man asked, "Why do you fight so much? What is the reason? It is not good to fight everyday." The husband replied, "We did not always fight like this. This is our third year of marriage. In the first year, if the wife said anything I would listen quietly. In the second year if I said anything she would listen to it patiently. This

is the third year. We both shout and the neighbours listen."

The question is how can we too reach that stage when we cannot hear the outside world and only hear from within us? This is possible through the practice of regulated breathing. As we progress in this exercise we can reach the soul.

Notes

1. In the original text the words used are 'rang' and 'varna'. Rang has been translated as colour and varna as hue.
2. In the original text the word used is paryay. It has been translated both as mode and condition in differing contexts.

RELATIVITY

Man is complete and incomplete

A gentleman asked, "Who is complete?" I replied, "I am." He then asked, "Who is incomplete?" I replied, "I am that too." He fell into a quandary. He said, "How can that be? If you are complete, how can you be incomplete too?" I had to reply again. "I live in the world of languages and therefore I am both. I live in the world where there is thinking and so I am both. I live in the world of memory, imagination and intellect and so I am both."

Any person who lives in the world of languages

can be neither complete nor incomplete. Beyond the world of languages, there exists no concept of complete and incomplete. This is the relativity in our language. With the help of language and thought we have helped our imagination cross the frontiers set by language. We have been compelled to cross the limits set by words to enter the world beyond words. All that remains there is existence. What is, remains, imagination vanishes. If this truth can be comprehended, then many philosophical discussions will also come to an end. All the complicated philosophical disputes exist in the world of language. Truth is beyond language. Truth and language can never go together, can never be of help to each other. The anekantic view has shed quite some light on this subject. What we think of as truth is, according to anekanta, relative truth. Then the question arises, do we not have the right to call truth the truth? Is all that I say untrue? It can be the truth if you accept your weakness. If you accept your incapability or the inadequacy of language, then it can be the truth. The limitation of language is that in one moment, with one word, it can only express one truth, when in actuality there are infinite truths.

The entire truth can never be grasped with one single word.

The weakness of language

Each object has many attributes. In an atom itself there are many attributes and that, too, opposing pairs of them. To explain infinite attributes at the same time is not humanly possible. Through words, only one attribute or one mode of the object can be described in a said moment. The rest remains infinite. If then we accept one mode as the truth then the infinite unsaid ones will be falsified. Infinite truths get cancelled and only one is accepted. If this is accepted as the whole truth then it is a misconception.

This is one of the most common limitations of language that is impossible to overcome. One can think that in one moment if one truth can be expressed, in one's long life all the truths will inevitably find expression. This is a wrong notion. Never has this happened, nor will it ever happen. No one born into this world has, till today, been able to explain the whole truth, nor will he ever be able to. Such a possibility does not even exist. How

many moments are there in life? How long is one's life? There are very few moments and the time is short. In comparison to the huge world of truth, to the infinite attributes of truth, the lifespan of a man is not even as large as a small droplet of water on a tiny twig. Such a short lifespan and such a large world of truth; it is not even long enough to touch the borders of truth!

The new meaning of the word syaad

Only the enlightened, God or the Omnipotent knows the infinite truth, but even they or He does not have the capacity to be able to express its myriad dimensions in words. It is impossible. A great man, an intellectual, can enumerate some ten or twenty or even fifty aspects. None of us can ever articulate the entire truth. When we accept the few aspects we see as the entire truth and negate any other possibilities, then we are actually moving away from truth itself instead of towards it. It is in this context that anekanta gives a suggestion. Anekanta says that you can escape traveling towards untruth if you take the help of the word syaad. Prefix all that you say with syaad and that will save you from untruth. The

essence of the meaning of syaad is, "I am unable to express the whole truth and so present one aspect or mode of truth."

In ancient literature the word syaad has many meanings. I want to present it in new light. The meaning of syaad is the acceptance of one's inability to express, to accept the limitations of language. The one who uses the word syaad immediately declares that he must not be taken as telling the entire truth and that it is just one aspect. That he is informing the listener of only one aspect. And at the same time he is expressing his inability to know the entire truth. This is the merit of the word syaad.

A student told his mother, "Mother, I have won a prize today. A competition was held. Questions were asked and I answered." Pleased, the mother exclaimed, "Your answer was correct, O thank you Lord!" But the boy answered, "Mother my answer was not entirely correct but was close to the truth and so I got the prize. My classmates got the answers wrong." The mother asked, "What was the question asked?" The boy said, "The question was how many legs does a cow have? All my friends said two while I said three. Since mine was closest to the truth, I got the prize."

The word syaad takes any answer closer to the truth. It does not reveal the entire truth, a possibility that does not exist where language is the medium. Syaad gets you as close to truth as you can and so sometimes earns you a reward too.

One cannot find a more beautiful way of realizing truth. If there was the non-committal syaad with every argument, there would perhaps be no arguments at all, no persistence to any single point of view would ever be heard. Passions are easily aroused because whatever one knows one reacts vehemently to it on the basis of the idea: what I say is the truth.

There was a pundit, a learned man in the king's court. He was a great scholar, logician and he was obstinate. If anybody came and said he was speaking the truth, the scholar would immediately refute him and make his words seem meaningless. Once the king said, "Pundit, you are indeed very mischievous. You refute everybody. Tell me what you think of this idea of mine." The pundit replied, "This is wrong because it is your opinion, not mine. What is not my opinion can never be right, it has to be wrong."

Everybody thinks like that. Everybody seems to

draw the limits by asking for agreement as though saying, "Agree with me and you will prosper, you will go to heaven. Otherwise you will go to hell." This, indeed, is a strange world. If I think of something or say something there will be no dearth of people who will take the credit for it saying I am copying them. There is nothing like independent thinking. Tell me, has anybody taken property rights over truth? Man has so much ego and aggression that truth keeps getting buried somewhere below it all and it is his opinion that floats on top. To go beyond the bondings of stereotyped thinking, beyond the confines of thought, learning, imagination and the intellect, the word syaad is the only answer. The word syaad tends towards objectivity. According to it, all that is being said and has been said, should be listened to, relatively. Without that the meaning would be turned upside down. Do not react with vehemence. Understand with regard to the situation and the context in which a particular word is being uttered. Clinging to mere words can be dangerous. It takes us away from truth. Very often I worry that listeners may just cling to my words. I say repeatedly that observing one's

breath is observing one's soul. One should not understand this phrase outside context, for that can create chaos. If the listener sticks only to the word, then the practitioner will stop at observing his breath alone. He will be able to make no further progress. He will never be able to reach the soul. I am not wrong when I say that observing one's breath is observing the soul. Breath is material but not physical. But is breath not the vital force? Where the breath is material or *paryapti*, there it is also the vital force. Of the ten vital forces, one is breath. How is breath not the soul? That which is the vital force is connected with the soul. If the context is not understood, it will be chaotic. If we, however, do not understand the context, then we should either not believe that the breath is connected with the soul or we should stop observing the breath. To stop observing the breath means to return without even entering the first door to meditation. The doors ahead remain closed. Further progress becomes impossible if we get stuck with the thought that the breath is the soul. We cannot take the next step and this becomes an impediment to progress.

Absolute and Relative

Let us not talk of absolute truth. We should accept the relativity of truth and that truth can never be absolute. Where there is absolute truth, there can be no discussion about the relative and the absolute. There languages cease. Only truth remains, no relativity or absolutism. That is why Bhagvan Mahavir has said, "Where there is indeed (real) truth, from there language returns. Neither intellect, nor thoughts nor even the mind goes there. All of them return They are not able to reach there. All our alternatives stand on language and the intellect. The one who accepts the reign of language, of the mind, the intellect and thoughts, he has actually accepted the invitation of untruth."

There was once a very intelligent courtier. He progressed on the merit of his intellect and became the king's favourite. One day he sat down for a meal with the king. The cook brought the food. He served them and asked the courtier, "Tell me, how is the food?"

The courtier replied, "Very tasty." The cook intervened by saying, "O King! Today I have used all my intellect to cook. Surely you too must be

finding the meal very tasty?" The King replied, "Horrible. There is so much salt that it feels like eating poison, tell me what do you think," he continued looking at the courtier. The courtier agreed with him entirely. Astonished, the king exclaimed, "But just now you praised it. How can the food be both good and bad?" The courtier replied, "Sire, I draw my sustenance from food. I also draw my sustenance from you."

This becomes the situation: when we start drawing our sustenance from language, intellect and thinking, then we lose contact with truth. We go away from truth. In the world of language there is no way of getting in touch with truth except through relativity. Each statement is relative and we should try to understand their relativity. The question is why should we understand it so? There is sufficient reason for that. Its basis is the rule of the primary-secondary nature of attributes. There are two aspects of truth about any object. One is the secondary attribute and the other the primary attribute. One is the manifested aspect or mode, the other the unmanifested aspect or mode.

The primary is only one

One of the most dominant rules of this world is that the primary is always one, never two otherwise problems crop up. The theists have accepted God. They had to add an adjective: *Kartumkartum anyathakartum samarthaha ishwaraha.*

The Nyayasastra asks why we should consider *ishwar* or God as one. Giving a meaningful answer to the question it says: If we were to think of God as many, then there would be many problems at the beginning of creation. One God would want creation in a certain way and another in another way. There would be argument between the two. And creation would never take place. Where there are many, there arguments are inevitable. When there is one, there can be no argument, no discussion. With two, arguments begin. In Sanskrit the word for two is *dwand. Dwand* has two meanings. One is the noun denoting the number two and the other means struggle, war, conflict. Being two means conflict. People ask: Husband and wife are two. If they are two, that implies disagreements and possibilities of fights. This is the world order. If there are two and there is no fight, then it is viewed with surprise. That

is why the theists believe in only one God, where there can be no fight, no discussion.

In the pursuit of truth also it is important to follow the norm of one. In a given situation when objects may have infinite attributes, one of them will be primary and the rest secondary. One attribute will be manifest while all the others will be unmanifest. A very beautiful state. In nature also a similar situation exists. When a man walks do both his feet rise together? No, this never happens. It is not possible to raise both feet and walk. The rule is that one foot goes ahead and the other follows. This is the order of movement. Till today nobody has been able to break this order. If there is to be movement, then this has to be the order, or else the situation is different. One can continue to stand or one leg, but with both legs in the air, one cannot stand.

Acharya Amritchandra wrote a beautiful verse:

Ekena akarshanti slathayanti vastu tattva mitrenna
Anantena jayati jaini nitirmanthannetramiva gopi.

When a milkmaid churns for butter, one hand is outstretched and the other is behind it. Then the hand behind comes in front and the one in front

moves back. Following this order, she is able to extract butter. If both the hands were to go ahead together and go back also together, then the process of churning will not happen and no butter can ever be got.

The development of democracy also works on the same principle of the primary and the secondary. If one man is the primary one, the others become secondary and follow him. If anybody else comes ahead, then the one who has been in front moves back. This is the ideal situation. When a hundred people want to occupy the same chair, democracy becomes helpless.

A significant sutra or rule of anekanta is that one will be pre-dominant while all the rest will be secondary. It is on this basis that relativity has developed. The one who is important will move ahead with reference to the others. They can never progress independently or in the absolute. They are connected to the leader and the leader keeps them connected to him. Nobody can be independent in the sense of the absolute.

In a Sangha, a religious community, one man becomes the Acharya, the others remain his disciples.

Can the one who becomes the Acharya be independent? Never. Respected Kalugani used to say that the Acharya's position makes him more relative. At every step he has to keep connection with others. A sadhu,(monk) is not in a position that is as relative. He is able to do many things independently. But the Acharya...waking up, sitting, sleeping, talking, eating, moving about, everything happens in dependency...he has to take the help of some monk. His independence is limited. Once Acharya Shri Tulsi told me, "Sometimes I feel like quietly going and doing my work." I said, "If you do that it will be more troublesome for others. For the word will inevitably spread and, anguished that you have gone alone, five or ten monks will go running hither and thither and nothing would be achieved."

During meditation I say, "Close your eyes." Do not consider even this as absolutist. In the field of meditation, anekanta is used to the full. We have to make use of relativity to its hilt. Close your eyes. Why? The objective behind this is that you do not influence the one who is training you. That the one who trains is saved from the influence of your meditation. Can meditation be done with open eyes

too? Indeed yes, meditation can be done with open eyes too. And very well at that. When many thoughts crop up then meditating with open eyes is a very good option. All the thoughts will immediately disappear. Then one wants to know why not meditate with eyes open. It is wise to understand the loophole also. When the eyes are closed the view of the outside world is closed and so the ability to look within is created in greater measure. When we meditate with open eyes then we tend to get distracted by the outside world and so move away from the inner. That is why Bhagvan Mahavir advised that the eyes be half closed, neither fully open nor fully closed. This has a major advantage. This makes us aware that there is an inner world and an outer one. Eyes half closed means breaking your links with the outside world. Eyes half open means establishing links with the outer world. We should keep both these goals in sight. We should accept the outer and the inner world. The outer and the inner world are relative. Bhagvan Mahavir has said, like the outer the inner and like the inner, the outer. The one who meditates should accept both.

Relativity is a great science

The word syaad informs us of relativity. Without it we cannot know the truth nor can it be explained. This truth had been propounded two thousand five hundred years ago but our philosophers could not hold on to it. We should confer monkhood on the contemporary scientist who proved that without relativity truth cannot be explained. He got idea the of relativity so adroitly that today the scientific world looks towards it for all explanations. All science and scientific beliefs that developed before the idea of relativity now stand annulled. Today in physics, math and statistics the concept of anekanta is being used uninhibitedly; relativity is being employed freely for further research and study. Today science contends that without relativity no great truth can be explored. When the great scientist, Einstein, said that time and space were relative, then there was great commotion in the scientific world. Many scientists did not accept this. They could not understand how time and space could be relative. But gradually this concept could be understood, was proved and today it is an accepted norm. We explain any event with respect to time and space, but we

forget that time and space themselves are relative. The relativity of time and space was explained by a scientist and not by a Jain follower of anekanta or syaadvad. They had not done any significant work in that direction. How wonderful it would have been if what Einstein had said, a Jaina had proved earlier. Were these ideas not clear before them? Was not the concept of relativity clear? The ideas and concepts were clear but they did not think of its articulation in a new context. Do Jains think time is not relative? No, time is always relative. We have divided time into three parts: past, future and present. Why was it divided? Time can never be divided, broken. Time is never such that you can think of it as having gone by. The scientists of today are engaged in research in this direction: to recreate the times of Mahavir, Buddha, Krishna and so on by going back some two thousand years in time: that the man of the present should be able to hear the preachings from Mahavir and the Buddha. That the present day man should hear and see Mahavir preaching non-violence and equanimity, the Buddha preaching compassion and Krishna delivering the message of the Gita. Can such a possibility exist? To an ordinary man it may seem

impossible for one who is dead and gone, who has been cremated, how can he be seen again? This is an event of the past. How can the past be recreated as the present? To me and you it may seem as an event from the past, but to the scientist who views time and space as relative, it may not be so.

The method of thinking and its many pictures

In the Jain agamas there are five kinds of knowledge explained. Among them the fourth is *manahaparyavagyan*. The one who has this knowledge reads other people's minds. He is able to know how the other person is thinking. In Nandi sutra this knowledge has been discussed at length. In the discussion, the writer has posed many questions and given their answers too. The question: "Can manahaparyavagyan look into the mind of a person who lived ten thousand years ago?" In the text of the reply it is said, that, yes, it can be known very clearly. Another question asked is, "Can manahaparyavagyan know the mind of a person to be born fifty thousand years hence?" Time has become one. There is no past or future everything has become the present.

It has become relative. That which we think of ten thousand years ago still exists. How? Jain philosophers have given an explanation of that. They have said: Our mind is material. We think through the medium of matter. Matter has categories, associations and an environment. For thinking we use matter. After thinking the thoughts scatter. They become free particles in air, in the cosmos. The cosmos is a treasure house, a wonder. There are a lot of things lying around there. It is good that contemporary man is not able to see that or he will be obsessed with looting it! His fascination with other treasures may also wane. The one who sets out on a quest for the treasures in the sky will give up all other quests. Against this background where we are sitting, one does not know how many pictures of thoughts of how many beings are hanging. Lakhs and crores of them. No painter has painted these pictures. They are those that are born out of thoughts of every thinking person. These pictures cannot be read, they can only be seen. Thinking never takes place in language but in pictures. You may know that in some cultures the script for language was pictorial. All details of thought are

expressed pictorially, not through words or script.

It is the work of our mind to prepare the pictures. If a man thinks of building a house, then he has a picture of a house in his head. If he thinks of a car then the picture of the car is made in his mind and if he thinks of bread then a picture of that is made in his mind. Wonder how many such pictures we make in our mind everyday. No artist in the world has ever made so many in one day. In fact all the artists of the world together cannot make so many pictures. Is there any man who is not an artist? We are all artists. But the world calls only those artists who are able to make ten-twenty-fifty paintings. All the human beings who make thousands, millions, billions of pictures in their heads, they are not called artists. Strange. This is not an imaginary situation, it is reality.

There was a man in America. A very strange quality developed in him. If he thought of any object, the object would clearly present itself in his head. In a room with high frequency, these pictures were downloaded. They were in accordance with his thoughts. In the Times, the pictorial representations of his thoughts were published. When he thought of

a car a beautiful car appeared in his head as a picture. When he thought of a beautiful skyscraper, a picture of it appeared in his head.

Dispersion of rays

As a person thinks, his thoughts are turned into pictures by the mind. The picture is an exact translation of the thought. As soon as the second picture comes in, the first one vanishes from the head and moves to the atmosphere. This keeps happening. The picture that goes into the atmosphere may remain there for a million or billion years. So then why are we surprised to think we may be able to see Mahavir giving us his teachings? Why should it surprise us to think we may be able to see the person of Mahavir, Rishabha or Buddha. There is one guiding principle: everything has rays. Rays are emitted from every object. This is a significant principle. Whether the object is a sentient one or an insentient one, man or animal, pitcher or house, all objects constantly emit rays and then scatter into the atmosphere. If this were not possible then the television would not be working. It would not be able to catch any picture on its screen. It is able to

catch pictures only because of the constant emission of rays. We can see pictures of our body, of our speech and even of our mind. Rays from the mind, speech and physical body are scattered all over in the atmosphere.

Relativity is everything

If our consciousness is able to tear away from the limits of time and space, then there would be no past, no future, it would all be the present and the present alone. Only the consciousness which becomes infinite, remains. Let us not get stuck with definitions of infinite. So much is clear that, to the enlightened, there is no past or future. They can see each event, whether it belonged to the past or is yet to happen, with tremendous clarity in the future. They can see it happening. To them there is only today, only the present. But of course it is worth reminding oneself that when there is no past or future, there is no present either. These three words lose all meaning. All that remains is the event, that which is. It does not disappear even in infinite time. Is this possible without relativity? Anything bound by time and space cannot be independent. Time and space are

connected to our events. This is so because no event can be explained without time and space. We take the help of these two measures and explain events. Without them the explanation is not possible. Sometimes we have to refer to the place and sometimes to the time. Where to go? Right or left? Which is right and which is left? Without place such explanations cannot be given. Using any point as the reference we can identify left or right. Otherwise there can be no left or right. Now it is 3.30 in the afternoon in Ladnun. Is it the same time in Moscow too now? Is it daylight there? Day and night cannot be identified without the concept of relativity. Without the idea of relativity, up and down cannot be identified. When the earth was thought of as flat then there emerged the idea of up and down. But now that we know that the earth is round, where does the idea of up or down make sense without the idea of relativity? Up, down, small, big, all these are relative terms. Small and big. Who is small and who is big? Nobody is. The measure is relative.

The teacher told the student, "Shorten the line drawn on the blackboard without erasing any part of it." Now, how is it possible to make it short and

yet not rub a part of it? The student was intelligent. He drew a longer line, thus making the original line appear shorter.

Small or big is relative. Light or heavy is relative. Even gravity is sometimes high and sometimes low. Where there is no effect of gravity there is weightlessness, nothing is light or heavy. Blemishless, soft and hard, these three terms are also relative. Who is blemishless? Who is soft? Who is hard? All are relative terms depending on individual experience. Everything about us is relative. If we forget the word syaad and look at everything as independent, then we have problems. It has been said that Gods live for millions and billions of years. This is surprising and yet not so. Let us not forget relativity. Those who are beyond the effects of gravity are beyond time. A thousand years here would not even be like a second there. In the Jain agamas there is a passage that reads: A man died. He went to heaven. He thought of going back to earth to meet his family. As soon as the idea struck him he began making the necessary preparations. All the Gods asked him where he was going. He replied, "I am going back to the world of mortals to

meet my family." They replied, 'Oh! You have just come, wait a while. See the fantasies of this place." He tarries. He thinks for but one second. And then he comes straight to earth. He searches for his father, mother, brother, sister and friends. He enquires about them from people. Nobody is able to tell him anything. Many thousands of years seemed to have passed. Many generations had gone past. He thinks everything was but a minute ago! But on earth, a lot of time had passed.

The two rules of anekanta

The search for truth should not turn into a labyrinthine one. The man who sets out in search of truth should not get lost in a labyrinth. To grapple with all these problems anekanta has given two rules, which I have explained in detail. The two basic rules are : primary and secondary. Man knows one primary manifested mode, the mode that stares him in the face. But he should not forget that behind it are many unmanifested modes. Along with that one manifested mode, many unmanifested are hidden.

Anekanta says concentrate on the primary attribute but do not treat it as though it is the

absolute. With your statements add the word syaad. With this it will be clear that reference is being made to the primary attribute. The rest are all secondary. But if you think of the primary attribute as the only one, then you are losing your way. The thread of truth will slip from your hands and the partial truth will also turn into untruth. Relativity cannot be given up in the pursuit of truth nor can the word syaad be dispensed with. All the philosophers and thinkers who did not use the word syaad have become uni-directional in their explanations. Their philosophies have become limited to one aspect.

Reality states that with every truth there is a certain point of reference. It is relative. This truth is being looked at from any one perspective. If we can understand its point of reference, if we can grasp that vision, then we can move towards truth, or else, we cannot. Today it is of utmost importance to add the word syaad to our expressions.

Why is dinner prohibited?

Once a question was posed to me as to why dinner after sunset is prohibited amongst the Jains? Honestly, can there be a time specified even for

hunger? It is practical to eat when hungry. This is the only valid rule. For hunger there can be no day or night. How does light or darkness matter?

At a seminar in Bangalore where many scientists took part, the subject came up that in the Jain tradition, dinner after sunset is prohibited. One should look for reasons for the same. A gentleman came to me with the question. At that time I was in Delhi. He posed the question. I replied, "Yes indeed dinner after sunset is connected to religious beliefs because it is not sanctioned by religion. But along with this there is a scientific reason for it also." The heat produced in our bodies digests whatever we eat. Our digestive strength is the heat. For it to work efficiently the heat from the sun is essential. When sun rays are not available, digestion suffers. Digestion becomes weak. Therefore the one who eats at night suffers from indigestion. This is the scientific reason.

The second reason is that when the sun is transmitting heat small micro-organisms are passive. No sooner does the sun set, they all become active. They give rise to many types of diseases. The way illness makes you suffer at night, it does not

during the day. Disorders of wind too trouble more at night. All these problems occur at night because the heat of the sun is not there at that time. When there is heat, diseases are not aggravated. As the sun's heat wanes, diseases gain in strength. All the trouble-making elements become more potent.

Not only thieves even germs trouble only at night. It is not only insomnia that chooses nights to torment, even illness troubles at night.

An Acharya of long ago once gave a reason for prohibiting meals after dinner. It may or may not have scientific value, but it is definitely interesting.

Emperor Akbar had great respect for Acharya Hiravijayji. A few people resented it. One man went to the king and said, "Sire! You give a lot of importance to the words of the Jain Acharya but many of his ideas are wrong and his beliefs are baseless. We think of the Ganges as holy, but he does not. We think of sun as God, but he does not." The king heard him and somewhere in his mind got a little perturbed. He asked Hiravijayji, "Do you not think of the Ganges as holy? Do you not think of sun as God?" Replied the Acharya, " Now, who told you that? We have great respect for the Ganges and the

sun. We are devoted to the Ganges. People go there, bathe in it and all the dirt of their body is washed into it. We stand afar and do not even touch the water, forget soiling it with our body dirt. As for the sun, nobody respects it as much as we do. Just as being separated from a loved one, man stops eating, we too stop eating once the sun sets. Can you not see how loved the sun is to us?" The king agreed.

Syaad is the royal pathway

Every statement is with reference to something. Absolute statements cannot exist. Anekanta shows us the way to understand this secret. It reduces attachments and aversions. The use of the word syaad is the royal pathway through which we can cross the most dangerous ravines. This is such a royal path that evens out the ups and downs along its way making travel easy. May we evaluate this great principle of relativity with the required importance and use it exhaustively in our great quest for the truth.

THIRD EYE (1)

The philosophical journey: travel guide of anekanta

An Acharya taught his disciple the lesson of anekanta and said, "Now travel into philosophy. Read all philosophies, read all the strong views, and all those philosophical arguments which seem untrue, make a list of them and bring them to me."

The disciple began his journey. He read all the philosophies. The journey was now over. He came to the Acharya. The Acharya asked, "Has your travel come to an end?" The disciple said, "After completing it I have come to you." The Acharya said, "Now bring

me your note. Tell me briefly about all the philosophies that you found to be untrue." The disciple replied, "Gurudev, my hands are empty."

"Did you not get paper?"

"I got paper, but it is still blank. I could not write on it."

"Did you not get a pen?"

"I got a pen, but it did not move."

"Why did it not have a nib?"

"It did have a nib, but it did not move."

"Did you not get ink?"

"I did get ink, but there was nothing to write."

"Did no philosophy seem untrue?"

"No, nothing seemed untrue and so I could not make a list."

"Disciple, now you may go. Your learning is complete. You have passed in brilliant colours."

An exactly similar situation I see in the incident where Acharya Atreya of Takshila University told his disciple, "Go to the forest in the outskirts of Takshila and get me those plants that cannot be used as medicine." The disciple went humbly to carry out the orders of the Acharya. He roamed around a lot. Finally he was totally fatigued. He came back empty

handed and presented himself to the Acharya. The Acharya asked , "Child! Have you not followed my orders?" The disciple answered, "Sir, from morning to night I have roamed about the forest. I have searched every nook and corner of it. But I could not find even one plant that did not have medicinal value." Pleased the teacher replied, "Child! You have learnt the science of healing and medicine. Your education is complete."

What was the reason for not finding even one plant that did not have medicinal value? What was the reason for not finding even one wrong opinion? Not even one philosophy that was invalid? Is this the work of some sort of magic? Is there no untruth or invalidity in this world? If there is no untruth in this world that means everything is the truth. And if this is not true then why are we not able to find untruth?

To the one who practices anekanta, no philosophy is untrue. Untrue philosophies are possible for only those who think uni-dimensionally. To those who have accepted the principle of anekanta there can be no untrue view. Then the question arises as to which is a comprehensive view and which is not. If a conventional man were to reply to this he would

say, "My sastras or holy books are true and yours is untrue." But if the same discussion were to be considered from the perspective of anekanta or spirituality then the reply would be, "No sastra is holistic or untrue." To the man with right perceptions, all philosophies seem true and to the man with warped perceptions, every philosophy seems baseless or untrue. The truth or untruth of a sastra is dependent on our vision. When the eye of anekanta is opened then everything seems true, nothing is baseless. As long as we see with only the two physical eyes, things get divided into true and false. One person is loved and another not loved. One thing is acceptable and another, not. But when the third eye is opened then there are no likes or dislikes, there is only an entity. When the third eye is opened then nothing is destroyed or created, nothing is permanent or eternal, a third category is formed. This third eye is that of anekanta.

The secret of anekanta: the opening of the third eye

The Acharyas of anekanta have said that there is nothing permanent or impermanent in the world. The eye that looks for permanence is one

and the eye that looks for impermanence is another. But the third eye is that which sees the truth. When that third eye opens, a third category comes into being. That is neither permanent nor impermanent but is both permanent and impermanent. One man sees equality. Another sees the inequality. But with the opening of the third eye, there is no equality or inequality, everything is both equal and unequal...making for a separate category. The opening of the third eye or the creation of the third category is the greatest secret of anekanta. As long as we continue to live between two categories, we will not be able to catch the truth but will find ourselves eternally grappling with truth and untruth. With the opening of the third eye, a third category comes into being. That which is, begins to present itself. An Acharya of anekanta said:

Syannashi nityam sadrsam virupam, vacyam na vacyam sadasattadev.

It is explained as follows.

Truth the third category

When the third eye opens, the existing does not

remain the truth, the non-existent does not remain the truth, but a third category comes into being which is a unison of both existence and non-existence. Some say an object can be described, some say it cannot. Some say that a certain thing can be said while some others say it cannot be said. One philosophical view believes that one can describe an object verbally and another believes that one cannot describe an object verbally. Truth is always inexpressible, indescribable. Truth cannot be spoken. But it cannot be without words either. Another person says what is truth if it cannot be spoken? Truth should be expressible. One eye sees the verbal expression and the other the inexpressible. When the third eye is opened then everything is neither expressible nor inexpressible, it is both expressible and inexpressible. This is the truth.

Without opening the third eye of anekanta we cannot solve philosophical matters or practical matters. Today's science has posed many problems and their possible solutions and man is engrossed in them. Without anekanta we cannot find their solution either.

Anger: reason and pacification

One man asked, "Can the habit of anger be changed?" I said, "It is possible." He asked, "How is this possible? How can a habit be changed?" Those who believe in permanence say nothing ever changes with the soul. From the fluxist's point of view everything can be changed, nothing remains. If the third eye opens, then the habit of anger can be changed. If the third eye does not open then anger can never be controlled.

Why does one get angry? Now this is a good question. Those who believe in circumstances will say it is circumstantial. There are such situations, such circumstances in the world, which one cannot help but get angry with. If circumstances alone were responsible for anger then there arises no question of pacifying it. We will first have to change the circumstances. Then automatically there will be no anger. In this world there can never be a situation which is not influenced by circumstance. If one circumstance changes, then five new ones will be created. One problem will be solved, five more will be created. Circumstances can never come to an end. Problems can never be uprooted.

A campaign was launched: Grow more grains. Use chemical fertilizers and improve yield. This order came into being. With chemical fertilizers, the yield no doubt, increased, but the nutrition in the grain decreased. Grain became harmful to such an extent that those who consumed it, even died at times. On the one hand we make attempts to control population. On the other we have medicines trying to improve the longevity of man. And at another level we have the use of chemical fertilizers that takes the lives of people without intending to. This is a cheap option to reduce the population. Poisonous medicine, poisonous grain and family planning...I can see no difference between the three. All three seem to say the same thing. Politicians are very clever. They do not opt for direct killing instead they advocate the use of material that is sweet to taste but meets their ends too. If circumstances can never cease to be, our anger too can never be completely pacified. It is possible to pacify anger only with the opening of the third eye.

Third eye means equanimity

Our third eye is the eye of equanimity. We have

two eyes. Our right eye symbolizes attachment and the left, aversion.

A father went to his daughter's house. He sat down for a meal with his son-in-law. His daughter began serving the meal. She served a rice preparation to both of them. Then she was to serve clarified butter. She began to think: should I serve my father the ghee? If I should then how much should I serve him? My husband is sitting next to him. If I give him more or less than the right amount, there will be chaos. My husband will get angry. She looked at her husband through her left eye. The father saw that and understood everything.

The left eye has some peculiarities.

As long as the two eyes denote like and dislike, anger will remain. Anger dissolves with the opening of the third eye. The third eye is the eye of equanimity. Then there is no attachment or aversion for matter, but a realistic view, a true view. This is equanimity. Matter is just matter. No matter is likeable or dislikeable. With changing time and place the same object may become favourable or unfavourable. If we look at it from the anekantic

viewpoint then no matter is either entirely favourable or entirely unfavourable. As the idea of anekanta develops, the feelings of like and dislike towards matter begins to decrease and the third eye which looks at matter as matter begins to function.

The great maxim for meditational practice: Anekanta

Anekanta is not merely a metaphysical concept. It is our complete guide to practical life. It is a great maxim for meditational practice. As long as passions are not assuaged, likes and dislikes are not reduced, the third eye of anekanta is not available for us. To access anekanta we need meditational practice that will reduce attachments and aversions. As passions are assuaged and a balance is found in like and dislike, our third eye of anekanta develops. All views seem to change and the matter remains as only matter. It is neither favourable nor unfavourable. When there is no like or dislike, how can there be anger? Anger is not born of circumstances alone. As long as man likes one and dislikes another, anger will never subside. As attachment reduces, and the more it reduces, anger will reduce in the same proportion.

Anekanta is the real eye

One gentleman asked, "Is there rebirth? After death is the soul born again? Is this possible?" I replied that if you know destruction and creation, then rebirth is possible.

If one eye is open and watches destruction, the other watches creation and you see only with two eyes, then of course rebirth is not possible. Why should we even discuss it? What is the use of such a discussion? One day a being was born and came within our vision. We saw his birth with one eye and his death with the other eye. With both eyes we saw his life and death. When we see with two eyes, the question of rebirth does not arise. If we want to know about rebirth then we have to develop our third eye. We have to search for the third eye. We have to develop the vision of the third eye. We have to open the eye of anekanta.

Permanence is the third eye

Origination and cessation are two principles. The third is permanence or *dhrauvya. Dhruv* means immortal. That which never dies is *dhruv.* That which never comes to an end. *Dhrauvya* is the third

eye. We have to open this. This is the eye, which discerns the truth. Once this opens the question of rebirth just does not arise. Today science recognizes that matter can neither be created nor destroyed. Not a particle will increase or decrease. It only changes in form or undergoes transformation. According to Jain philosophy, the concept is that neither will a new element originate nor will any old one be entirely destroyed. So then why this question about the soul? Do atoms perish? If it has disappeared and you believe it to be finished, it is fallacious. We drank water. Now it is finished. Does that mean it has disappeared totally? If disappearing from sight is synonymous with termination, then why ask such a question about the soul? Why is this question not asked about atoms or about clouds. Sometimes we see the sky absolutely clear and at other times, filled with dark clouds. Where have the clouds gone? Have all the clouds finished? In such an interpretation every entity in nature, every object, every atom would cease to exist. But once we know the existence of something it can never cease to be. This aspect of permanence will be understood when the third eye is opened. When the eye of

anekanta is opened, one realizes that neither is birth the truth nor death. They become true only when they are accompanied by permanence. Unless the eternal is added to any argument, truth cannot be arrived at. And unless the whole picture is before us, we cannot find the truth. The third eye should open, the eye of permanence should open.

Man is male and female

A gentleman asked, "Girls become boys and boys, girls. Sex change is brought about. Is this true? Is it possible?"

I said that it was not impossible. If we look at them with only two eyes, then it is impossible. Because till now we have seen that a boy is born as one and dies as one and similarly a girl is born as one and dies as a girl too. Our two eyes are used to categorize a boy as the male and a girl as the female. We have not seen a girl change into a boy or a boy change into a girl. So with our present vision we find it impossible to imagine. To see the reality the third eye is necessary. The eye of anekanta is necessary. If we look through the eyes of anekanta, it will seem possible. No possibility will seem remote.

According to karma sastra, there are three *veds* or principles: *stree-ved*, the female principle, *purush-ved*, the male principle and *napunsak-ved* or the neuter principle. In every man and woman all three principles are found. Man is a male and woman is female. How then can all the three genders exist in the two? This is the real question. That a man is male is the manifested mode. In the unmanifested modes he is both a female and a neuter gender. No man is fully a man. No woman is fully only a woman. Every man is a woman as well as belonging to the neuter gender. Every woman is a man as well as belonging to the neuter gender. The neuter gender is male as well as female. If the manifested gender is male then he is a man. If the manifested principle is female then she is a woman. And yet in spite of the manifested traits how many men are feminine and how many women are masculine!

A queen was sitting in her garden. A parrot's droppings fell on her. She became angry. She stomped into the palace and went to bed in a fit of anger. The king came. Seeing the queen angry he enquired the reason. Getting to the bottom of it all she told her husband, "Either you get all the parrots

of the kingdom killed. Or I will commit suicide." Now the king was in a quandary. On the one hand was the apprehension of killing thousands of innocent parrots. On the other was the queen's threat of suicide. The king tried to appease the queen, but it was all in vain. He got thousands of parrots killed. The leader of parrots came to know of this. He himself came in front of the king and speaking like humans said, "O king! Why are you destroying our race? You are a protector why have you become our predator? The king was astonished to find a parrot speaking like a human. They talked for a while. Finally the king asked the parrot, "Tell me, are there more men or women in this world?" The parrot was pensive for some time and then said, "In reality, they are exactly equal. But those men who blindly follow the advice of women are also women. So by that count there are more women and less men."

Wonder how many women are there in a man's form and how many men in women's form. It has happened that in one single lifetime man turns into a woman and later becomes neuter gender. All three genders become manifest in that person. Many instances of sex change are found in ancient Jaina

texts. Today science has proved that sex can be changed. It has happened in olden times too as it is happening now.

The world of unmanifested modes

Think about this on the basis of anekanta. The information gained from gross or manifest modes is not complete. The world of manifested modes is very small. That which is not manifested is a much larger world. Gross modes are few, the subtle ones many more. As long as we do not step into the world of the unmanifest or subtle modes, all decisions will be single dimensional, incomplete. From the viewpoint of anekanta, they would be considered untrue. The meaning of anekanta is not just to explain rules. It explains the subtle modes or traits too. Many scholars of anekanta limit the use of anekanta to the gross world. This way they are narrowing the scope of anekanta, it gets bound within limits. The boundaries of anekanta are vast. It says do not interpret truth on the basis of the rules that govern the gross world or purely on the basis of *vyavahar naya* or the empirical perspective. The largest doorway to truth is through the world of subtle

modes or the world of *nischay naya* or transcendental perspective. Till there is no mutual connection between the empirical and the transcendental, the third eye cannot open. The opening of the third eye itself means the coming together of the transcendental and empirical perspectives. The opening of the third eye means an equal awareness towards the gross and the subtle modes. When we are exposed to new facts we are bewildered. But there is no reason to be bewildered if we can understand the transcendental perspective or the secret of subtle modes. Then there is no bewilderment. We are surprised because of our lack of understanding. Dogmatism is the result of our lack of understanding. Conservative tensions, blind beliefs are all because of our stupidity. Man catches on to one thing and clings to it obstinately. If another point of view is presented to him, he gets angry, impassioned.

One day a politician got angry with his secretary. He said, "I told you to prepare a speech of fifteen minutes duration and you gave me one which was one hour long. I got tired reading it. The listeners also protested. I was insulted. You did not pay

enough attention. You are not fit to be a secretary."

The secretary replied, "Sir please listen to me also. I had prepared a speech of fifteen minutes only. It had been made into four copies. You took all the four copies and read each one after another."

Man gets lost in dogmatism and does not know where he is heading. And then there are many difficulties. Dogmatism is created because man pulls the curtains down on the subtle world. He rejects the subtle world totally. Accepting only the gross modes that are manifested and legitimizing only the gross rules, kills the very being of truth.

Science benefits religion

Common people without hesitation say science has killed religion. I believe that nothing else has fostered religion as science has. If science had not explored and discovered the world of the subtle modes and subtle truths then the many dogmatic philosophers would have turned more violent and that would have resulted in many more conflicts. The third eye of philosophers is not open yet and so there is constant dialogue and argument. They see only with two eyes.

The eye of anekanta or that of equanimity and neutrality has not yet opened. The reason is that philosophers have turned away from the search. They have forgotten the methodology of the search. Nowadays there are discoveries made everyday. They are engrossed in research. Science has presented many subtle truths before us. It has helped express many unmanifested modes. Some beliefs that fell into the category of superstitions just a few years ago are now proven scientific facts.

The peak of numbers: shirshaprahelika

In the Jain agamas the computation of very high numbers has been explained. The name for that is shirshaprahelika. In that context, today's numbers seem very small. If to one number, two hundred and forty zeroes are added then we arrive at that figure. This is an outstanding number. When science went into the subtle details of mathematics, then shirshaprahelika was proved and was valued as a great find.

Sound is science's great gain

In the Jain agamas there is the example of a bell.

It rings in one place. Influenced by its sound vibrations, thousands of bells far away begin ringing. For innumerable yojanas[1] this happened. People said it was imaginary. But when science proved that fast movement of sound waves were responsible for the event, this truth was established. Today it is a significant finding of the science of sound.

Man will not be able to find truth until he moves towards the subtle modes of life.Until the vision of anekanta develops, movement in that direction is not possible.

The anekantic view in meditational practice

Even in the field of meditational practice no progress can be made without the opening of the third eye. The third eye opens when all the dirt in the mind is washed away, when all the dust and garbage heaped on the mind is cleared, then the mind becomes as clear as a looking glass.

A gentleman came and said, "Sir, my situation is strange. Whenever I sit down to meditate or pray, then many thoughts crowd my mind. Thoughts that have never crossed my mind appear and many impressions get created in the mind. So I think that

when I do not practice meditation or indulge in any spiritual or religious activity, my mind does not get crowded with so many thoughts. So I give up meditation."

I said, "Within the mind there is a lot of garbage. There are many memories and impressions there. When we focus the mind, we interfere with those impressions. When the mind is scraped clean these impressions and memories come up all over again. The dirt that is hidden emerges once again before going away. It is good to remove this dirt. That is the path to development."

In meditation we need the anekantic view. Through it all problems would be solved. When we are dogmatic about one thing, then there is a problem.

Awakening of the *kundalini*

Nowadays there is a lot of discussion on the *kundalini*[2] all over the world. To awaken it has become a yogic act. In the entire yogic world there is a lot of discussion about this. A storm has been raised over the awakening of the *kundalini.* I would like to know of one man whose *kundalini* has not

been awakened. Every man's *kundalini* is awakened. Whether he practices yoga or not, his *kundalini* is awakened. Food is digested in the body. How? Food is digested by the *kundalini.* There is heat generated in the body. What is the reason for this? The *kundalini* is the reason for this. *Kundalini* is the energy of our bio-electrical body. It is the energy of luster, effulgence and light. It is the entire body's temperature. The heat of the bio-electrical body is the *kundalini.* It is always awakened. It can become more potent and there are many ways to achieve that, not just one. It can get further awakened with yoga exercises or meditation or *pranayama.* Through fasting and penance also it can be made more potent. Humility, reading of scriptures, meditation and kayotsarg are also means through which it can be further awakened. There is not just one method of awakening the *kundalini.*

Different people: different solutions

Meditation does not suit some people. Yogasana and *pranayama* does not suit some people. This is because each person's body composition is different. The mental level of the mind is also not similar.

Some people's mind is so fickle that they are not able to meditate. In this situation we should once again resort to the anekantic view. We should measure every person independently. Understand them as different individuals. Those who cannot do meditation, make them do some chanting (*jap*). Make them practice breath-control. Make them practice with the vibrations of sound. The one who practices *bhramari pranayama* gradually drifts into meditation. Sitting in one posture, the practitioner makes the sound of a bee for five, ten or fifteen minutes and slowly drifts into a state of meditation.

For everybody the same solution does not work. One cannot cling to just one thing. All the dogmatism and persistent assaults against truth are results of looking at only one aspect.

Desisting dogmatism: anekanta

A man was drinking water. There was more dirt in the pond than water. Along with the water he was drinking, he was taking in some dirt. But he continued drinking. A sensible man said, "A little further away there is a pond full of water. Go there and drink clean water and quench your thirst. Why

are you drinking this dirty water?" The man replied, "This is my father's pond. If I drink water, I will do so only from here. Or else I will remain thirsty."

This is dogmatism. This is because the third eye, which sees the truth, is not open.

It is greatly necessary for the contemporary world, that man's third eye opens. The third eye is that of anekanta.

Notes

1. *Yojana* is a measure of approximately 12 miles
2. *Kundalini*, often referred to as serpent power in English.

THIRD EYE (2)

The location of the third eye

A gentleman remarked, "The third eye is located in the middle of our eyebrows. The eye with which Shiva reduced Kamadeva to ashes, that is the third eye. In the dictionary of yoga, the third eye is the *Agya chakra*. So, then how can you say the third eye is that of anekanta?"

The question is valid. In yoga the *agya chakra* has been referred to as the third eye. When it grows in potency, even Kama can be turned to ashes. Whether we think of this as an ancient myth or as an aspect of

yogic penance, it is the truth. If we reflect on this truth with *Sharir sastra*[1], *manasa sastra*[2] and *kam sastra*[3], then the truth becomes all the more clear. To clarify this truth also, anekanta is of use. While reflecting on any truth if we consider only one aspect of it then even truth can turn false. Only when we look at it from its different perspectives and answer different questions arising thereby can we say we are talking about truth. Anekanta is the third eye because it is different from the two physical ones. With these two eyes we see the gross world. If all our activities took place on the basis of the gross world then we would use only the empirical perspective: the perspective that would enable us to see the different gross modes. But our world is not just the gross or just that which is visible. Our world is subtle, unmanifested and formless. If we interpret our lives purely on the basis of the gross world and what we see then truth will go helter-skelter. With half-truth no solution can be found. To understand the whole truth, to find a comprehensive solution, we have to take into consideration both the gross and the subtle world. This is the basis of anekanta.

Substance and modes

Some philosophers have, purely on the basis of the empirical perspective, explored the truth of matter. Some have explored the truth of matter in terms of the transcendental perspective.

Thus there are two strains of thought: one which follows the perspective of *dravyarthik naya* or the substantial perspective and the other which follows the *paryayarthik naya* or the modal perspective. One, a perspective, that explains and explores the wave theory and the other, a perspective that explains and explores the unfathomable ocean beneath the waves. The two cannot be divided. We see the network of waves before our eyes. When there are many waves in the ocean, then only are they visible. The ocean is hidden below them. Those who saw only the waves of the ocean gave explanations of the modes and their results. They said that the whole world was changing, that it was being recreated. Those who saw that this change was not real and that the truth is that which is hidden below the change were able to grasp the root substance and explained that.

They categorized the waves as unreal, as untruth. Waves were thus left out. Both perspectives got

divided, became uni-dimensional. The whole truth was not comprehended.

Why is anekanta the third eye?

Anekanta is the third eye because it does not give an explanation on the basis of merely the substance or of its mode. Its perspective is not simply to understand the unused substance, nor is it a perspective that understands only the modes. It is a dual perspective. It is not just substantial or modal but dual. It is the third perspective and therefore anekanta is the third eye.

The turning of ashes of Kama with the third eye

We should reflect from the anekantic perspective, on the third eye in our body. Some people ascribe the story of Kama to a specific situation. The situation when opposite sexes face each other. Then Kama's influence rises and starts working. This is not the entire truth. Unless we reflect on this with an anekantic view, it will be difficult to understand.

Today physiologists and sexologists have reflected greatly on this matter. They have experimented and

proved that Shiva did really burn Kama with his third eye.

The order of origination of Kama or love

In our body there are two important systems, the nervous system and the endocrines. Four endocrine glands are very important: the pineal, the pituitary, thyroid and adrenal. While all the endocrine glands play an important role, these four are especially important. Even among these four, the pituitary is of greatest importance. In medical science it is called the master gland. It influences our activities a great deal. Looking at it biologically, it must be said that physical attraction does not come from just the presence of a man and woman but it happens when the secretion of the pineal and pituitary glands reach the gonads. The pituitary secretes gonadotrophing. This reaches the gonads and influences the sex glands. But this is not the entire truth. And by knowing all this, the problem is not solved. Only the biological perspective is gained. We have to go even beyond this. We have to think with the transcendental perspective. Biology is truth from the empirical perspective, based on gross, visible

facts. We could go ahead and enter the zone of karma sastra. The karma sastra says that due to the rise of *mohaniya karma*[4], sexual feelings are aroused. *Stree-ved, Purush-ved* and *napunsak-ved* are sub-categories of mohaniya karma. When these are aroused, when they mature, then sexual desires arise. To go even ahead, the psychologist working in the spiritual field would say, when our emotional system works well then the stirrings of love are felt.

All these are uni-dimensional statements. They have not reached the entire truth even now. If we use them then we are harnessing truth. There are four points. The first is the emotional system, the second is maturation of karma, the third is glandular secretions and the fourth is the external stimulus of physical proximity. When all these four things happen together, then carnal desires are felt. This could not have been understood or explained without anekanta.

When our emotional system is working well, it influences one part of our brain. That part is called the hypothalamus. That in turn influences the pituitary glands. One secretion of the hypothalamus is called pampatine. It is through this chemical, the

pituitary is influenced. As soon as the idea of sex comes to the emotional system, then feelings of anger or fear are born. This in turn affects the pituitary. All the mental influences or tensions come to the hypothalamus. It is a storehouse of tension. When this part of the brain is full of stress, it influences the pituitary. The pituitary in turn influences the thyroid and the gonads. This way a whole chain of our mental tensions is created. When carnal desires arise then the pituitary influences the sex glands and the gonads. When there is anger or fear, then the pituitary influences the adrenal gland. Thus there is a complete cycle:

1. The activity of the emotional system influences the brain.
2. The brain influences the pituitary.
3. The pituitary influences the gonads, thyroid and the adrenal.

When this cycle is completed then we experience pride, fear, sexuality etc.

What was known in ancient times as the *agya chakra* can today be called the pineal and the pituitary glands. Both these glands are located within the area of the *agya chakra.* The *agya chakra*

is said to be located near the eyebrows, but this is not entirely true. The agya chakra falls where the first half of the thumb falls when we place the central part of it between the eyebrows. The whole region where we apply tilak or the vermilion mark on the forehead is the region of the agya chakra. Within its boundaries fall both the pituitary and the pineal. Both become deeply connected. The pineal has many secrets. Initially it is the pineal which influences sex but later leaves the job to the pituitary, and moves away. The pituitary is able to cope with this responsibility.

How to conquer sex?

If a man wants to practice celibacy by simply restraining the reproductive organs, it is not possible. The area below the navel is the reproductive zone. If all the attention was paid only to this area, celibacy would be difficult to practice. For celibacy, one has to meditate on the area of the throat. The mind should focus all attention on the limits of the four glands, the pituitary, the pineal, and the thyroid, not to mention the hypothalamus. The one who wants to conquer anger, sexual passions etc.,

should exercise restraint on the upper part of the body. By just concentrating on the lower part of the body, passions are not reduced.

It is now easy to understand how Shiv put an end to Kama with his third eye. The one who is able to, with the help of meditation, refine the working of the agya chakra, refine the center of intuition and the working of the pituitary and the pineal glands, conquers sexual passions. When these work well the secretions undergo a change. With meditation, concentration, a pure conscious mind and resolve, the secretions are restrained. It does not go to the lower parts of the body. If the secretions do not go downwards then automatically sexual passions are put out. This idea of the burning of Kama or of the third eye cannot be understood without anekanta.

The anekanta of meditational practice

Circumstances are not everything. To put all the blame on it is not fair. Circumstances can be changed and they will change, but what happens to the emotional system within? How can that be changed?

Bhagvan Mahavir was asked, "Noble teacher! Some people say one cannot meditate in the village.

It can be done only in the forest, in loneliness. Is the place of meditational practice, binding?"

Mahavir said, "Child, Meditational practice can be done anywhere in the village as well as the forest. And yet it cannot be done anywhere either in the village or in the forest."

This is the anekanta perspective of meditation.

One Acharya wove the same sutra or lesson into this language:

Ragdweshu vinirjitya kimrannye karishyasi?
Ragdweshu anirjitya kimarannye karishyasi?

If you have conquered passions, then what will you do going to the forest? If you have not conquered passions then what will you do going to the forest?

The basic lesson is that we should reflect on all problems from the viewpoint of anekanta. Whether the problem is a practical one or a spiritual one, a social one or a political one, they can all be solved with anekanta. With uni-dimensional perspectives, problems become more complicated, more entangled. Man falls into a stupor. He begins to think, "I am not the creator of the problems. I am only trying to save myself from them. The problems are created by some one else." This kind of illusion envelops him.

The husband told the wife, "I can hear somebody calling from downstairs. I think my friend is calling me. You go down and tell him I am not home". The wife replied, "You never tell lies, but today I have lost that respect for you." To this the husband replied, "Oh no! I really do not tell lies. That is why I am telling you to tell them"

Where the perspective is only from one angle and the entire picture is not apparent then man gets into trouble. He is not sure what he is doing. He gets entangled in his own language.

We should try and understand the principle of anekanta. Anekanta is the third eye. It is even larger than the eye that rests between the two eyebrows. Till this eye does not begin to function, the principle of anekanta cannot be awakened and nothing can be seen as right. Our actions and thoughts will not be right.

Three views

There are three views: right view (*samyak drishti*), wrong view (*mithya drishti*) and right-wrong view (*samyak-mithya drishti*). Both wrong view and right-wrong view influence us. We cannot grasp truth

through these two. Only when we move away from these two views and adopt right views does the consciousness of anekanta blossom within us. Even this has a biological reason. The hypothalamus in our brain has two special hormones. One is called melatonin and the other seratonin. These chemicals influence our character. They influence our perspective. According to karma sastra, *mohaniya karma* influences our consciousness, numbs it. If the atoms of numbness were not there then our mind would never get distorted. Our conscious is infinite and limitless. It does not have the limits of time and space. The secretion of melatonin creates distortions in our character. It is responsible for sexual passions, anger and fear. The other chemical, seratonin also influences us greatly. It influences our perspective. Its main activity is to inhibit the conscious brain. It swarms the brain covering the consciousness.

The bad influence of intoxicants

L.S.D. is much discussed today. It is improbable to think that the present-day citizen, the one who studies in the university will not know its name and use. In some university campuses, *sadhana kendras*

or institutions where meditation and yoga are being taught, L.S.D. is also being used extensively. This is because after using it just once, man begins to have hallucinations and go through varied kinds of experiences. He thinks he has actually been transported to heaven and other such new worlds. Then he begins to think L.S.D. is a gift of god. L.S.D. contains seratonin. Our brain too has seratonin. It affects our brain in great measure. It distorts our very outlook. It becomes a false outlook. Seratonin influences the entire conduct, which becomes full of distortions.

The effort of meditation is to change these secretions. When we contemplate on the center of peace (*shaktikendra*), the center of enlightenment (*jyotikendra*) and the center of intuition (*darshankendra*), our hypothalamus is influenced. This in turn influences the pineal and the pituitary glands. When these psychic centers are influenced, the secretions change.

In the method of *Preksha Dhyan*, the meditation on the psychic centers is very significant. It is significant because without this a man cannot be transformed. We may meditate on the breath or on

the body or even on colours, but the truth is that unless we get to the root of it, that is, unless the psychic centers are influenced, the secretions cannot be changed and a man's behavioural pattern cannot be altered, his habits cannot be altered and his nature cannot be altered. Without energizing the psychic centers, the conscious mind cannot be awakened, numbness cannot be avoided and perspectives cannot be changed. We can say that till then the perspective does not have right base.

The third eye: from the perspective of substance

From the perspective of substance, the third eye is permanence, eternal. We see origination and destruction with our two eyes. Till we are not able to see the permanent, we will not have developed the capability to see the eternal. Our third eye cannot be opened. From the perspective of substance, the third eye is the ability to see permanence.

Third eye: from the ethical perspective

If we look at it from the ethical angle, it is obvious that there is a deep link between our conduct and substance. The love for matter is represented by one

eye and the dislike for it by the other eye. With only these two eyes conduct cannot be purified. Conduct is refined when beyond these two eyes, the third one opens. Then matter remains just material, there is no like or dislike. There is a balance. That is the third eye. From the angle of conduct, the third eye is one that gives equilibrium.

Third eye: from the perspective of opinion

From the perspective of opinion, the third eye is neutrality.

A thinker holds on to one point of view, tries to prove it and gets attached to it. Another thinker holds a different view and sticks to it just as adroitly. The first one decries the second and the second the first. Both regard each other as opponents and look at each other with aversion. Attachment towards one's ideas and aversion towards the other's; both the eyes of attachment and aversion are doing their respective jobs. Only when the third eye is opened will the perspective of balance emerge. As soon as the third eye opens, your opinion fades away and so does the other opinion. What remains is the truth and a balanced perspective.

It is common to be attached to one's perspectives. Acharya Hemachandra presented a charming truth with the following sloka:

Kamaragasneharagou, ishatkaranivaranou
Drishtiragastu papiyan durachchedaha satamapi.

Sexual passion and the passion of affection can both be easily removed. Between a husband and wife there is sexual attachment. The mother has bondings of love with her son. Both these attachments can be erased on trying. But the passion with which one holds on to one's views is very difficult to erase.

The passion towards one's views causes a lot of destruction. Even stalwarts are not able to give this up. There are those who have left their homes, their families, given up the love of their parents and cut off relationship with their friends...they have given up everything but not the attachment to their opinions. They are themselves caught in that. The attachment to one's views is a dangerous kind of attachment, bonding.

A householder's family is made of the mother, father, husband, brother, sister and so on. The monk's family is the sastra or sacred texts. A monk gets as attached to his texts, as entangled within them

as one could possibly imagine a householder with his family. To remain neutral to contrary views is not easy. Neutrality manifests itself when the third eye is opened. When anekanta, which links the empirical and the transcendental, manifests itself, then the third eye opens. In other words, balanced views are arrived at with anekanta.

The possibility of neutrality

A gentleman asked, "Is neutrality possible? Strange question. What answer could I give? How can I say it is possible and how can I say it is not? Neutrality is not possible as long as there is attachment towards one's views and aversion towards the other's views, as long as there is belief only in the validity of one's own views and of the confirmed invalidity of the other's views. When one's wisdom awakens to that which lies beyond attachment and aversion, validity and invalidity, then neutrality is possible. Then along with the two eyes, the third one is also awakened. This way neutrality is possible and not possible too.

An event occurred. People complained to the king that Acharya Hemchandra did not bow before

Lord Shiva. The king was a Shiva devotee. Acharya Hemchandra was taken to the Shiva temple. "Why do I not bow?" he asked and folding his hands in the namaskar gesture, he said,

Bhavabijamkurujanaha ragadhyaha
kshayamupagata yasya
Brahma va vishnurva haro jino va namastasmai.

In other words, there are two seeds of the life and death cycle: attachment and aversion. In the One in whom these two emotions have been totally wiped away, be He Brahma, Vishnu, Shiva or Jain, I salute all of them.

The use of the third eye

The one whose third eye is opened does not stop with the name. He goes towards the nameless.

The one whose third eye is opened, does not stop with the form. He goes towards the formless.

The one whose third eye is not opened gets stuck and entangled with name and form. Name and form...these two factors have kept all religions and philosophies entangled. The man caught in its web can neither be spiritual nor can he be one who practices meditation. The knot formed by the name-

form tangle is unraveled only when the third eye of anekanta opens. Acharya Haribhadra has said:

Pakshapato na me vire na, dweshaha kapiladisu
Yuktimad vachanam yasya tasya karyaha
parigrahaha.

I am not prejudiced in favour of Mahavira nor am I prejudiced against the sage Kapila. Mahavira is not my friend nor is Kapila my enemy. I respect the one whose words are full of reason.

These words could have been spoken only on the basis of anekanta. Only that person whose third eye of anekanta has been awakened can say these words.

There is a text written by Acharya Haribadra called *Shasravarta samuchay.* In this text he has shown the mutual connection between seemingly opposing beliefs. Through this exercise he has made anekanta very powerful.

To the one whose third eye has been awakened nothing is false. His constant touchstone for truth and untruth would be: that which is relative is the truth and that which is absolute, devoid of any relativity would be false. Beyond this there is nothing else. It is on this touchstone that he accepts a belief or rejects one. He does not find out where this

thought is coming from. Or who is the one who is propounding the thought. He is just concerned about whether what is being said is relative or not. If it is relative it is acceptable, if it is not relative, it is not acceptable.

Over this long period in time, great acharyas such as Acharya Samantabhadra, Acharya Vadidevasuri, Acharya Hemchandra have given very comprehensive expositions of the vision of anekanta and the many possibilities of the awakening of the third eye.

Today there are many more possibilities because today the world of knowledge is far more encompassing.

Philosophy and reality

In ancient times there were many schools of philosophy. It was a tradition to ponder philosophically over every conundrum. But in those days philosophers did not think of yoga as a philosophy. It was considered different from philosophy. Philosophy was understood as explaining the truths of substance while yoga was understood as training in meditation. The philosophical aspect of

Sankhya was called philosophy whereas the process of meditational practice was called the yoga philosophy. They were separated. One cannot say this division was right. In actuality philosophy is that which can present a comprehensive picture of all the truths in our life. Meditational practice is indeed the philosophy of the real. But in olden times only an understanding of substance was called philosophy. Because of this, the scope of philosophy was limited. The entire world was left untouched. The philosophy with which we have no connection, through which our present day problems cannot be solved, that philosophy may be useful for some extra-terrestrial but is not so for us who live on this earth. The philosophy may be useful for other things but definitely not useful to man. Of what use can that philosophy be which does not touch on problems? How can that which is so cut-off from problems be called a philosophy? Indeed, a philosophy of matter cannot be life's philosophy. In a state of confusion it has been accepted as one. This confusion is similar to what happened to this man who told his friend, "Brother, the sun and moon are two. Of the two the moon is more useful because it gives light when there

is darkness. What is the use of the sun? It comes out during the day. And during day we have daylight anyway. At night it is dark. Then the moon rises. The whole earth gets lit with moonlight. So that which spreads light in darkness is of more value. The moon is therefore more useful."

A similar confusion has occurred in the field of philosophy. Philosophy is useful because through that we gain knowledge of matter, of creation, of the soul (*atma*) and the paramatma. Life is not ever tackled. It is kept separate. But only that is accepted as philosophy. This is similar to saying why know of the uses of the sun? Only the moon that lights up the night is useful. The sun has no use in contemporary times.

Due to this confusion in the world of philosophy, there have been many catastrophes. Today it is essential to change this vision.

A gentleman called attention to my goal by saying, "Today you are talking of spirituality, meditation and yoga. But till now you have written only on philosophy and were completely involved in unraveling the complexities of philosophies. Today you have left them all behind and are talking of spirituality and yoga."

I heard him. I felt like laughing thinking how odd the world is. In actuality what I am doing now is the real work of philosophy. I have just begun my work on philosophy. Till now what I was doing was borrowed work, the basic work. It was a purely intellectual exercise not one of the mind or the consciousness. That was a small task. The job that can be handled with the intellect, the mind and thought is a small job. In truth, philosophy is that which makes something clear. When we personify a truth, experience it, then it is philosophy. When it is not personified it is not philosophy, it is repetition. In reality we are just continuing to repeat. I repeat the matter contained in old texts. What I say is repeated by somebody in the future...this is an easy exercise, but not philosophy. A tape recorder repeats well. Man does not have that talent of being able to repeat verbatim. A computer or a tape recorder does this job easily. That cannot be called philosophy. That is simply parroting.

The first mark of philosophy

The philosophers who have crossed the boundaries of the mind, the nervous system, the glandular

systems, the material world and the sacred texts and have opened the third eye have taken the first step towards philosophy. They have awoken the wisdom of anekanta and through it manifested the truths of the world by understanding the composition of the subtle body and its associated consciousness. Where the intellect is in its complete form, there the first step towards philosophy has been taken. The last stop of the intellect is the first stop of philosophy.

The utility of logic

To think of logic as philosophy is a mistake. Logic is only a tool to manage day-to-day living. It is essential. One of life's riddles is day-to-day behaviour. In the art of institutionalization, institutions have to be maintained. There logic is also essential. Without logic, institutions cannot be managed. Logic is not without use. Anything viewed from the perspective of anekanta cannot be called useless, false or untruth. If a man were standing in a court of justice and he did not make use of logic he would lose immediately. A court functions on the basis of logic. The judge upholds the stronger logic and awards judgment thereby.

A case was in progress. A man had lost his arm in an accident. He wanted compensation. The judge asked, "Have you hurt your arm?"

"Yes, my Lord."

"Have you sustained a fracture?"

"Not a fracture, but my arm hurts a lot and I am not able to lift it."

"Was your arm able to rise before the accident?"

"Yes, it was able to rise fully."

"How high did it go?"

Immediately the man raised his arms completely and said, "This high."

The judge dismissed the case and the man did not get any compensation.

If there were no logic the judge would never be able to come to a decision. If there were no logic the defender would not be able to refute the offender. Logic and intellect, both are important. If these two were not there then man would go back to the dark ages when man's brain and logic had not developed. Without them man had faced many difficulties. Today with the development of the intellect and logic, man has widened the scope of his progress. He has crossed one stage. The bullock cart has for

thousand of years been drawn by the bullocks, it still is and will probably continue to be so in the future. It has made no progress because it has neither intellect nor logic. It continues to be where it was and will remain there. Man has, with his intellect and logic, crossed that stage of animal life. I do not mean to say the intellect and logic are totally useless. But one should not think they are everything. Even beyond this there is a world. That is the world of spirituality. There you will find the life of anekanta. Those problems that cannot be solved by the intellect and logic can now be solved with inner knowledge. The solutions to those problems can be found through the inner eye and the third eye, with the development of anekanta. When anekanta is awakened then neutrality sets into life. Then there is no prejudice against or for anything. There is a bias towards the intellect. There is a bias towards logic. The world of logic and intellect cannot be without bias. The intellectual and the logician take pleasure in proving his views and undermining the other person's views. We find fault saying a person is not fair or balanced. This is also our mistake. Within the limits of the intellect and logic such things will

happen. It is in the nature of things. It is not a great thing not to be balanced. There is only one way of being unbiased or balanced and that is to awaken the third eye. Once the third eye is awakened, biases fritter away. No bias remains. It gradually reduces.

There is one method of awakening the third eye: developing the anekantic view. When this happens then the third eye opens.

Notes

1. *Sharir sastra* is physiology.
2. *Manasa sastra* is psychology.
3. *Kam sastra* is sexology.
4. *Mohiniya karma* could be understood as ignorance.

INDEPENDENCE

The rule for decisiveness: anekanta

A gentleman asked me, "Is independence possible?" I said, "Do not ask that. Ask if dependence is possible." He replied, "Dependence is very clear." To that I asked, "Why then is independence not clear?"

Independence and dependence are relative. They are connected with each other. If there is dependence then there will be independence and if there is independence there will be dependence. Both are inter-connected. One cannot exist alone. Absolute

independence or absolute dependence cannot exist. If they exist then they will exist together or not at all.

This is the concept of anekanta. People think anekanta complicates matters. It does not give a solution. Its reply is not clear. A person is not able to understand anything. Anekanta says man is good as well as bad. How can this be a practical principle? If there is the thief in the trader and the trader in the thief[1] then how can any conclusion be arrived at? Then what is the use of even hunting for the trader? We may as well collect a bunch of thieves for even in a thief, there is a trader. Practically speaking, this will not work. It will only worsen matters. The question then is whether social behaviour can be based on anekanta. Is it possible to model our pratical life on the basis of anekanta? Can any conclusion be reached on the basis of anekanta? It does not take us to the point of conclusion, to the stage of the definite. Anekanta teaches you to look both ways. A person learns to look at this side as well as that. Nothing concrete emerges.

That syaadvad takes man on a spin is not a new argument. It is age old. Anekanta does not lead a person anywhere but just leaves him hanging in the

middle. The language of anekanta is that of the indefinite. It is not certain.

It seems that this subject has not been reflected upon deeply enough and that is why such an idea has come up. If the subject had been reflected upon deeply then the emerging idea would have been that anekanta is the only principle that leads you to a definite conclusion. Apart from this there is no other principle that can lead you to a definite conclusion. Only with the help of anekanta can we reach a conclusion.

One man is bad, a cheat, a thief. No one wants to enter into business with him. This decision is taken on the basis of the present day circumstances. But a man's present mode does not say everything. There are four fundamentals of anekanta: matter, place, time and state. All our interactions are relative. All our decisions will be matter-relative, place-relative, time-relative or state-relative. No decision can be taken without considering these dependent principles.

One person is a thief, loafer, bandit. How one should behave with him will be decided on the basis of the present situation. However, this cannot be a

comprehensive conclusion because the man may have many other traits or potential. If we do not take into consideration his other traits then all our other matters come to a stop. If we refuse to accept that which will happen in the future, then there will be no room for progress.

A child is very naughty. If on the basis of his behaviour in the present the child is branded useless, then his future would be bleak. No parent ever does that. No teacher negates the possibilities of his student's improvement.

Take my own case. In my childhood I was dull. If at that stage Acharya Tulsi had labeled me as useless then I would never have become 'Mahapragya' (Highly knowledgeable), today. If on the basis of the present, future possibilities are negated, then all possibilities of progress are lost. Decisions are taken on the basis of the present, but alongside if the door of possibilities is left open, nothing is lost. Otherwise progress would be obstructed.

This event took place in the great scientist Einstein's childhood. He went to school. The teacher said, "You are dull, you cannot do maths. Your effort is wasted. To do maths it is necessary to have a sharp brain."

That conclusion was taken on the basis of the present and so relative to time. The same Einstein became one of the world's greatest mathematicians and earned the title of the most brilliant man of his times.

Anekanta is a great solution. It has not been understood. It never complicates. It does not talk indecisively. It leads you to the definite.

Anekanta is the rule for hard work and courage

The rule of anekanta: draw your conclusion on the basis of the present but do not shut the door of possibilities. Keep them always open. Think that today this possibility exists tomorrow it can be another. Thousands of possibilities may fructify. Depending on the pace of the life cycle infinite possibilities may manifest themselves.

Today a man is ill. His present mode of existence is that of an ailing man. If we take this as final then all possibilities of regaining health are negated and all the efforts being made to restore health to people will go waste. There will, in fact, be no effort made at all.

Anekanta gives the rule for hard work and courage. It says do not accept the present mode to

be eternal, to be all encompassing. The man who is ill today may be healthy tomorrow and vice versa. Try to remove the ailment; work hard at it, the mode of good health will manifest itself.

In meditation too anekanta cannot be forgotten. I ask a question to those who are beginning meditation. "Is your mind fixed or wandering?" If you say your mind is fixed then what is the point of coming here and partaking in meditation workshops? Go back home. If you say your mind is wavering, then what is the use of coming here? Go back home. This decision is taken on the basis of the present mode of the mind. According to this decision there is neither the need for you to meditate nor for me to lead the meditation. In anekanta the decision is made on the basis of future modes, on the basis of future possibilities. It is possible that the person who has a wavering mind that does not fix itself even for a second, has the potential of becoming a great yogi.

Syaadvad is the doctrine of possibilities

The meaning of syaadvad is to accept possibilities. It is surprising that Indian philosophers have always understood syaadvad as the discussion of the

doubtful, of the uncertain. But contemporary scientists have named syaadvad as the discussion of possibilities. This is indeed the right meaning. It lends a new perspective. Syaadvad is anekantavad and is the doctrine of possibilities. It is a perspective that accepts possibilities. The basis of this acceptance is: In the gross world on the basis of gross facts, decisions are taken. The question that arises is: is our world just as much as meets the eye? No! The world of the subtle consciousness is much larger than the world of the gross. The subtle world of manifested modes is far larger than the gross world of manifested modes. The manifested modes are few, those unmanifested are many more. The world of future possibilities is very large. They cannot be forgotten. The one who bases his decisions on all these possibilities makes the right decision. The decision taken on the basis of the present should be clear that it is taken on the basis of the gross manifestations of the present and with any change in circumstances/mode, the decision will also change. This way practical matters are not disturbed but on the contrary gain in efficiency. There is a man in service. Today he may be honest, tomorrow he

may cheat. Today he may cheat, tomorrow he may become honest. Today the one whom you trust may turn untrustworthy tomorrow. Today the one whom you do not trust may turn trustworthy tomorrow. We cannot function considering the present mode as the eternal or by understanding the finite as the infinite. By breaking the rule of relativity and replacing it with independence, no decision can be taken. All our decisions should be taken at a practical level on the basis of anekanta.

Independence and dependence

I was discussing independence. Who is independent in our world? Only on the base of existence can one be independent. The deciding factor of independence is relative to matter. Independence depends on the percentage of matter in the composition of the particular substance. Existence is independent. The existence of one does not interfere with that of another. A particle has its independent existence. Other particles do not interfere with its existence. They do not attack it or attempt to destroy it. Every object is independent in its existence. Sentience and insentience, are also

independent from the point of view of existence. Even souls have an independent existence and so does a particle. Where the question is of existence there is complete independence. No matter is under anything or dependent. In this world nobody is dependent on anybody. There is nobody who can exercise such control over anybody. Everybody is independent. This is a matter-relative decision. However, the decision taken on the basis of place can be dependent or independent. Today we are in this place. This is our place-relative independence. We cannot live in the same place for a long time. The place changes and that is a must. The decision taken on the basis of place will thus be relative.

The time-relative decision is definitive

Man is closely related to time. Matter is related to time. The decision of independence is based on time. The decision relative to the present is relative to time.

The great Buddhist philosopher Dharmakirti making fun of the principle of syaadvad said, "Syaadvad does not lead you to decisions. It says, this can also be and that can also be. Existence can

also be and non-existence can also be. Then why can we not think that yoghurt can be a camel and that a camel can be yoghurt?" While this argument is humorous to hear and if no object was always independent then why can a camel not be yoghurt and vice versa? The camel will turn into yoghurt and the yoghurt into a camel. This seemingly right idea has a fallacy. If a conclusion was arrived on the basis of the relativity of time, one would not have the courage to call syaadvad a doctrine of the indefinite.

On the basis of relativity of time, anekanta accepts that a camel can become yoghurt and yoghurt can become a camel. The question arises, if a man is ill and he needs yoghurt, can a camel be brought to him instead? Similarly if for travel across the desert, yoghurt were placed at one's disposal, would it help? There will be chaos. We should not neglect the manifested modes of the present. Anekanta would never give the result that the yoghurt is capable of carrying passengers or burden. Or that the camel can be used in the place of yoghurt for food. This is not acceptable even to anekanta. Anekanta says the conclusions arrived at on the basis of the present, are managers of contemporary affairs. Contemporary

affairs will be run on the basis of contemporary modes. Yoghurt will remain yoghurt and the camel, the camel. The yoghurt will not function as the camel nor will the camel as the yoghurt. But should we always negate reality? It is possible that the particles that have gone into the making of the yoghurt may actually in future go into the making of the camel. The particles that make the composition of the camel's body today, may tomorrow make yoghurt. We never negate this possibility.

Possibility and the present mode

Two streams of thought are clear. One is the stream of thought pertaining to the possibilities and the other is the stream of thought pertaining to present modes. On understanding both these streams of thought practical efficiency will improve and there will be no problem making the right decision either. A good decision is that which is taken on the basis of the present situation but taking into consideration all the possibilities. By considering all the possibilities the door to social, economical, political and spiritual development is opened. And by considering all these infinite

possibilities developments take place.

Man gets into a problem when there is a single perspective. A man employed a servant and decided that he was very honest. He nurtured him and gave him all the conveniences. One day the servant cheated him and robbed him of five lakhs of rupees. Now the master got terribly upset. He got upset because his perspective was single dimensional. He did not consider the possibility that one day he could also cheat. It is good to act on the present conditions, but future possibilities should not be ruled out.

Two men got into business together. One of them gets entangled with the present only and rules out all future possibilities while the other keeps the door of possibilities open and progresses on that basis. The first person repents and wishes he too had followed the other man's example.

All of man's hard work, courage, progress, creativity and plans are based on possibilities. And these possibilities cannot emerge without the perspective of anekanta.

The three-dimensional vision

Anekanta is a very significant sutra for knowing

the future, learning from the past and for living in the present. Anekanta does not rule out the future but keeps the past modes in mind and then arrives at the conclusion on the basis of the present.

Anekanta is a three-dimensional vision. It is not a single dimensional vision. It keeps as its foundation all the three time zones and three dimensions.

The time-relative vision ensures practical success. Where time is not taken into consideration many problems occur. A person puts in effort. Sometimes when he does not succeed, he feels unhappy. He feels he has put in so much effort and yet nothing has happened. That person is upset because he does not know anekanta. If he did know anekanta, then he would never be upset. He would think of hard work as the present mode but he would also know that if a man puts in effort, physically and mentally and yet is not successful, then there must be some other obstacle. That is the subtle unmanifested mode created from past deeds, which is creating a barrier. Without considering the past, the present cannot be defined. The future cannot be explained without considering the present and the past. The present is the time of fruition. The present is the time for

results, for creation. The present is influenced by the past and influences the future. The link between the past and the future is the present. One cannot imagine a present that is completely free from influences of the past. Psychologists listen to past events and analyze them to make the diagnosis. They make the patient relax and reconstruct the past. He listens carefully to the sequence of events in the past and gets to the root of the problem. By listening to the past events itself the doctor is able to understand what and when and how the patient has been affected and his mental make-up. Without the past, the present cannot be defined. A psychologist keeps heredity also in mind while treating the patient. Without that he does not arrive at any conclusion. No conclusion can be arrived at on the basis of the present alone. The past is relative to the present and so the conclusions drawn should also be relative to the past and the present. Both cannot be divided. Future possibilities are also based on the past and the present. The future cannot be decided free from considerations of the present. Today's religious men talk in detail about the future ignoring the present. It is said that religion can brighten the future even if

the present is not good. With religion the heavens are improved, even if this world is not. This argument does not worry about the present. One cannot project a future that is not based on the present. One cannot look into the future by breaking away from the present. By breaking the sequence of the present a future order cannot be visualized. Action and results are both relative. They cannot be cut off from each other. How relative is the anekantic perspective! Then how can one say that anekanta complicates? Can any principle be explained without understanding anekanta or the principle of relativity? Can the true nature of substance or life be explained without it? Never. The whole life cycle, the entire course of life cannot be explained without anekanta.

A certain man was in need of money. Another man told him, "You give me both your legs and I will give you Rs. 5000." The man plagued by poverty exclaimed, "What ! Give my legs? You want me to become lame? How can I go through the journey of life without legs? No I cannot give my legs." How can we understand this decision? Is it objective (an absolute decision)? No, it is relative to emotion and

present state. One does not know under what circumstances what events take place.

Sometimes a man has to lose his legs also. A road accident resulted in great damage. The doctor advised that the legs should be amputated otherwise it meant danger to life itself. The surgery cost Rs 5000. Now there was a man offering Rs 5000 for the pair of legs and here he had to spend that Rs 5000. A man who is not willing to lose his legs for a price of Rs 10,000 may allow amputation paying Rs 5000. If viewed from a single perspective then the man may not allow amputation even in this state and would lose his very life.

Many people think and speak this single dimensional language. They say the decision they have taken is final. Even when situations change, their decision does not. Nothing is permanent. Even the one whom we call *Parmatma* is not so unchanging, then why should our decisions be?

The component principles of a decision

Every decision has four components: matter, place, time and state. On the basis of these four components decisions keep changing. The decision

that does not change on the basis of these four elements, is indecisive. Anekanta says do not make any decision without considering matter, place, time and state. Say this decision is being taken under these conditions. If conditions change then decisions also do. The first decision is right under those conditions and the second right in the changed conditions. Both are right, relative to the prevailing conditions. If they had been objective (absolute in nature) they would have been untrue. Only by being relative, they become true. Relative decisions fall within the purview of truth. A man says he would not drink milk and after ten days begins to do so. Some people may say the man who changes his decisions like this is a chameleon. But that is not fair. His decision not to drink milk may be right in the first situation and the decision to drink milk may also be right in the second situation. In dysentery, for example, milk is like poison. If a man ailing from dysentery decides not to have milk, it is a right decision. The ailment is cured. If the same person decides to take milk after getting better, to improve his health, that is also a right decision. We cannot accept any decision as absolute. We should be clear that anekanta is not a

labyrinth. This is not one that makes you lose your way or one that complicates matters. It is the mantra for easy and simple solutions to all of life's problems. A man is not cheated and he does not create any new problems if he functions on the basis of anekanta.

Relativity is a great solution. When relativity is forgotten then we have conflicts, war. The reason for conflict is lack of relativity. The reason for conflict comes from a single dimensional viewpoint. The reason for conflict comes from not knowing the limits. It is necessary to know the limits.

A patient knocked on a doctor's door. It was midnight. The doctor was sleeping. Hearing the knock he came out. The patient said, "Doctor, a dog has bitten me." Replied the doctor, "Stupid. Look what the board says I do not see patients after nine o'clock at night." Said the patient, "I read the board, doctor, but what can I do! The dog did not know that it should not bite after nine o'clock at night."

Without relativity, without knowing the limits, we can talk of cutting, but not of binding.

In this world nobody is complete. Everybody is incomplete. Nothing is absolute, everything is relative. This is a fact in the social context as well as

in that of relationships. In its state of existence, every object is complete, whole. Where there is expansion, where a society is being formed, there is relativity and incompleteness. In this world if any man talks of absolute decisions or takes decisions independent of other things, he is committing a mistake. He is cheating himself. There is no principle other than anekanta that can acquaint us with relativity.

Infinite modes: infinite possibilities

Every principle has many modes. It cannot be said which mode will manifest when. The day Darwin announced that man too had a tail and that man was a descendent of monkeys, it seemed odd and religious people derided it. This derision was because of a single dimensional viewpoint. The meaning of a single dimensional viewpoint is the end of infinite possibilities. That man does not have tails cannot be said unilaterally. In Jain agamas it is said that some people have "langula" tails and some have "ghotakmukha", that, is they have horse shaped faces. Some people are 'hastimukha' or with faces like elephants. How can we totally disregard them? Where we reject possibilities, we create difficulties.

Ancient Indian literature is full of the use of the idea of Narsingh. One who has the body of a man and face of a lion, has the form of Narsingh. Is this possible? Yes it is. How can we disregard such possibilities? Such a man with the body of a human and face of a lion can be born. It is also possible for a man to be born who has the face of a fish and the body of a human, *Matsyavatar.* It is also possible for a man to be born who has the face of a boar and the body of a human, *Varahavtar.* These are rare, but such possibilities have been explored. To reject them will be in bad spirit.

Anekanta viewpoint is one that surrenders itself to truth. The world of variations (modes) is infinite. Without anekanta it is not possible to enter that world. No truth should be always accepted or always rejected. We accept that which is true in the present and reject that which is not true in the present, but with this clause that it could be true one day, it could become acceptable someday. Never close this door.

It is necessary to know the limits of the intellect

Acharya Bhiksu was well versed in anekanta. Once a man said, "Sir! I am not able to understand this

truth, how can I accept it?" Replied Acharya Bhikshu, " You have not become all knowing that you will understand everything. You do not know the limits of your intellect. It is necessary to know its limits. A man can understand only that much as his intellect allows. What if a pot says that it cannot accept that an ocean can exist? When I cannot contain so much water, then how can I accept that something else can contain more water? The pot has its limits and so has the ocean. That which can be contained in an ocean cannot be contained in a pot. But if the pot, not knowing its limits, rejects the ocean then it is no truth. Everybody is not endowed with the same intellect. To reject that which you do not understand is ignorance, is making contempt of truth."

Acharya Bhiksu resolved this matter in these words: Accept that which can be understood by your intellect saying that is understandable. If you do not understand something then say that since people more intelligent than me say it, I accept it. This way problems would not increase and you would not be courting untruth either.

Man should move ahead taking both extremities along. One extreme is the limits of the intellect and

acceptance of the present modes. The other extreme is that of infinite possibilities. When these extremities are healthy then there is mutual connection and balance between them, the principle of relativity is in operation and so any conclusions derived on that basis will be true.

Anekanta is the solution to problems

Acharya Tulsi had said, "When I am honoured, I do not feel elated and when I am insulted I do not feel depressed. I have got a lot of appreciation as well as been the butt of criticism. I keep a balance between the two. I do not bloom with praise and wilt with criticism. That is balance."

With dualistic perception relativity develops and the third eye of anekanta opens. With this life becomes healthy and harmonious. With it the door to infinite possibilities opens.

Let us clearly experience the fact that the co-existence of existence and non-existence is not a complicated matter. Every object or matter has existence within limits. Where its limits end, non-existence becomes operative. The solution to existence and non-existence and independence and

dependence is found only through relativity.

There was a yogi, a sage. His hair got tangled. He picked up a comb and tried disentangling it. The comb kept breaking. The tangle could not be combed out. A devotee said, Lord! This is the entanglement of a sage. It cannot be cleared with the comb. It needs a razor."

Anekanta is a razor. It disentangles problems that are as tangled as the sage's hair.

Notes

1. In the earlier chapters the author has drawn a comparison between the thief and the trader and between right and wrong actions, respectively.

RELATIVE ESTIMATION

The danger lies in knowing others

A workshop for meditation is going on and many people have assembled. They have come here so that they are able to awaken themselves, towards themselves. The question then is do they not have to know others? But in meditation we are going in the reverse direction. It is in man's nature to be highly aware of others and to know them well. He gets so aware of them, gets to know them so well that he forgets himself! In many situations and events our attention goes to others, not towards ourselves. This

is precisely why I place great importance on meditation for it helps transform this unilateral vision of thinking in absolute terms.

The man who meditates gets highly awakened towards himself. That is not a dangerous thing to happen. It is more dangerous to be highly awakened to others. There is no danger in knowing oneself, but to know others is not without dangers. Till today the one who knows himself has posed no problems but the one who gets to know others too well has posed problems. People who do not know themselves but know others have created all the major dangers that exist in the world today.

Making of weapons and circumstances

Why were weapons made? Only to get to know others! The reason is simple: the fear that some third person will attack, will enter, will kill, or loot. The main cause thus was security. As and when attention is diverted to others, then danger begins to loom. Man's nature itself has become such that he forgets the '*sva*' or himself and concentrates more on '*par*', that is others. He does not know the value of the word '*sva*'. He places far greater

importance on the word denoting circumstances.

To hide his failings man has an infallible weapon and that is to blame it on circumstances. This weapon has been given considerable importance. If you ask those who made the atom bomb as to why they did so, they would turn around and say it was circumstances that made them do it, or else they would not have.

Man, today, has become a victim of circumstances. He has given all the importance to it and it alone. This, in effect, means that man gives more importance to the peel than to the fleshy fruit within. The peel becomes everything to him.

Any person who thinks along the lines of anekanta cannot negate the importance of circumstances. Circumstances do have a value but only as much as a peel has. No sensible man eats only the peel. He looks for the flesh within. Is not the man hiding behind circumstances eating just the peel? He is giving it too much value, far more than it deserves.

Circumstances influence man only when he is inclined to be influenced by them. Somebody is insulted. An angry reaction follows. Circumstances have been created. Circumstances cannot be

rejected. But it must be understood that the insult produces anger only when the seed of anger is in man. But when the seeds of anger have been demolished then even a thousand insults cannot provoke him. In such people it is not easy to provoke anger. Any amount of effort taken to provoke anger may still be unsuccessful.

The equanimity of Sant Eknath

A saint of Maharashtra named Eknath was returning from a bath in the Godavari. A man was sitting in the balcony. When he saw the saint coming, he thought of making the saint angry. As the saint passed below his balcony, he spit on him. It fell on the saint. To cleanse it, the saint once again set off towards the river. He had a bath and once again passed below that balcony. The man spit once again and once again the saint went back to the river. This happened twenty times and yet the saint did not have even an iota of anger towards that man. The man was disheartened. In spite of such continuous effort he could not make the saint angry. He came down and fell at the saint's feet and said, "I have committed a great crime. Please forgive me." The saint replied, "You have committed no crime. On the

contrary you have helped me. Because of you I have become more fortunate. Everyday I go into the lap of the holy river Godavari once. You made me return twenty times to her and so I am grateful to you."

Blaming circumstances

Eknath had controlled the frightening prospect of getting angry. He went through trying circumstances but he did not get angry. Why? Because even though the circumstance was provocative of anger, the seed of anger no longer existed in Eknath. That seed had withered.

To the one who is constantly watching "others", only the circumstances stand out. He is not able to see the seed that gets influenced by circumstances. The one who follows anekanta and does meditation gives circumstances only twenty five percent weightage and attributes seventy five percent importance to the seed within, which responds to the circumstances. The one who does not practice meditation, does not know the secrets of spirituality and the anekantic perspective will continue to hide behind the excuse of circumstances. He will feel he is not to blame, circumstances are.

Existence and non-existence: knowledge of self not of others

Many people blame circumstances and go scot-free. The Acharyas who have explained anekanta have presented a similar problem to us. They gave importance to both existence and non-existence. They said every substance has existence from its point in matter, place, time, and state. Similarly, they said, every substance is non-existent with respect to another matter, place, time, and state. The essence of this is that with respect to oneself, there is existence and with respect to others, there is non-existence.

Here the view of spirituality has become slightly negligent. Why should non-existence be considered with respect to others? If we look at it from the perspective of relativity, then both existence and non-existence are of the self, of matter. It is not necessary that non-existence should always be with respect to others. Every object's existence is on the basis of its manifested modes and its non-existence is on the basis of its unmanifested modes. Every substance's existence is on the basis of the modes that are manifest and its non-existence is with respect to the many possibilities.

Napoleon Bonaparte used to say that the word impossible did not exist in his vocabulary. If this is looked at as arrogance then indeed he is very arrogant. But if it is looked as a principle, then what a lofty principle!

The man who follows anekanta does not consider anything impossible. People say that it is impossible to stabilize the mind. This is a mistaken thought. With continued meditational practice, the concept of the mind is demolished.

Mercury is very unstable, but it has been made possible to stabilize it too by binding it into the shape of a ball.

People say water cannot be retained in a sieve. Now even that is not impossible. Freeze the water into ice and it will not be able to pass through a sieve. It will rest.

If we hold on to something from a unilateral view, then we have problems. A sieve can or cannot hold water. The state has to change. With a change in state, the impossible becomes possible.

The expansive viewpoint of syadvad

Syadvad has presented an expansive viewpoint.

Through this many possibilities in knowledge, science and human personality are dancing on the wedge of existence. Nothing can be rejected. We find new discoveries everyday. The follower of anekanta should not be surprised. He knows that one and many go hand in hand. Truth and untruth go hand in hand. One mode is in existence and the other not in existence. What is in existence today may not be so tomorrow and what is not in existence today may be in existence tomorrow. In day-to-day life, when one man comes to power, another goes. The second comes into power; the first goes out of power. This is the order in the world of existence. Who thought that a member of the plant world would get *moksha* (*nirvana*)? Who thought undeveloped creatures with unmanifested intelligence would become omniscient (*kevali*)? This happened to Adi Tirthankar Rishab's mother Marudeva.[1] If we go only by appearances and what meets the eye in the present, then we can never imagine such a possibility. All this happens due to the unmanifested modes.

It is definite that both existence and non-existence are of the self. The existence of *kaivallya* (or the person with complete knowledge) is of the self and

the non-existence of *kaivallya* is also of the self. The existence of strength is of the self and its non-existence is also of the self. The existence and non-existence of bliss is also of the self. Both these situations should be estimated relatively. We should know the limits of both. It is very important to understand the limits.

The limit to oneself is experience. The limit to others is excessive thoughts. Man lives with thoughts, lives through others and lives through interaction till his experiences and his reflections on them, awaken. When he lives with his experiences, then he moves into the limits of the self.

Thought and experience

The conscious has two levels: thoughts and experience. Man, for most part lives at the level of thoughts. Imagination constantly throws up thoughts that find expression and finally disappear. One thought is assuaged, another emerges. The second one finds assurance, the third crops up. This sequence never breaks. Our journey of life takes place mounted on thoughts. We do not have the practice of remaining thoughtless. We do not have the

practice of experience. We do not know it. The name of the conscious is experience. Experience is an ocean of placid water. Within it there are no thoughts. Thoughts stirs the waters and makes it passionate and full of ripples. It does not let the ocean remain peaceful.

A man was meditating. He told his disciple, "I want to drink water. Get water from the river." The disciple returned empty handed. On being asked the reason he replied, "The water has become muddy because just now a few bullock carts passed through the river." He waited for some time and went to fill water three times after that but each time he found the water still muddy. The mud had not yet settled down. The disciple went the fourth time and returned with clean water. The teacher asked, "Did you understand anything or not?" The disciple replied, "What was there that was worth understanding? The bullock carts stirred the waters and so they became muddy. As soon as the mud settled, the water was clean again. There does not seem to be any great secret embedded in this happening."

To this the teacher answered, "This is exactly what has to be understood. When the bullock carts of our

thoughts traverse our minds and move out, then our mind becomes peaceful. It becomes clean. This cleanliness is experience. This is our conscious experience. When thoughts are subdued, then conscious experience rises. The one who does not meditate, who has not gone through the process of appeasing the mind of thoughts will never be able to have a clean and peaceful consciousness. How many bullock carts traverse the river? But the number that traverse the mind far exceeds the number the sum total of all the bullock carts in the world. With thoughts how can we make our conscious pure and clean? This is possible only when thoughts are emptied out. We learn to move away from thoughts and remain in a thoughtless state. The only solution to arrest thoughts is meditation. Only when we go into the depths of meditation is this possible. And meditation cannot be carried out without anekanta. Without anekanta the purpose and utility of meditation cannot also be explained."

Everything is possible in anekanta

There is nothing like impossible in the world of anekanta. It is possible for children, for youngsters

and even for old people to follow anekanta. Sometimes I wonder how some of the old and seemingly illiterate women who partake in the workshops on meditation will be able to grasp its essentials. How will they be able to practice meditation? But when I hear of their experiences and the results of their long durations of meditation I feel that the ease and determination with which these illiterate women understand and practice meditation, many very well read women do not.

Meditation and experience are pathways to the inner

The knowledge of meditation and experience is not bookish knowledge. Meditation is not closely linked with youth or old age. It is the way to the inner self, the way to assess the inner world. The man who has been able to estimate the value of the inner world will move ahead on this path. But one who has not assessed the inner world, but has concentrated on the world of circumstances alone, will not be able to move ahead on this path.

Living around the self: living around others

Assess the self and others. Assess both but from

different perspectives. Let us make full use of the principle of anekanta. It is has been our greatest mistake that we have shoved anekanta into the world of philosophy. Anekanta is the principle of meditational practice. It is not the rule for logic nor does it belong to systems of logic. It is the perception of the pure conscious. One who is not trying to cleanse his psyche cannot access the view of anekanta. Anekanta is accessible only by a spiritual person. Only the one who has pacified passions and is not agitated or plagued by biases can access anekanta. The one who has learnt to live around the self has the potential to become a follower of anekanta. But the one living around others, does not stand a chance of understanding anekanta.

It is an old story. One day Shiva called his sons Kartikeya and Ganesha. He told them to go around the world. The one who finishes first would be eligible for a prize. Kartikeya was strong. He sat on his mount and set off to accomplish the task. Ganesha was on the heavier side and his mount was the rat. "Whatever the prize, the race is very difficult. I cannot even think of winning it," thought Ganesha.

Circumstances are never binding on man. He tries

to make the impossible possible. Without knowing it anekanta enters our life.

Ganesha began exploring all the possibilities. He thought he just had to find a way. "Defeat is mine, but I must think of the possibility of winning." He concentrated deeply. He found the solution. He got up. He went around Shiva three times and sat down. Kartikeya returned some time later. He had complete confidence in himself and his mount Garuda, the eagle. He told Shiva, "I have finished, but Ganesha has not. Poor chap how could he have gone. His vehicle is the rat. Give me the prize" Ganesha said, "I returned before you." Kartikeya asked, "If you never went, then how did you return? You have been sitting in the same place." Ganesha laughed and said, "I have circumambulated the world thrice." Kartikeya asked in wonder, "How?" Ganesha replied, "I went around Shiva, three times. In him reside the three worlds. Shiva is the world and the world is Shiva. The world is not separate from Shiva." Replied Shiva in a decisive tone, "Ganesha has won and Kartikeya has lost."

The one who lives around the self always wins while the one who does not live around the self but

depends on others always loses.

Desire propels man. Only the one who lives around the self can overcome desire. The one who is always obsessed with objects can never overcome desire.

Man has many desires, mental dispositions and aspirations, obsessions and passions. They may all never be fulfilled. Till now history tells us no man has been able to satisfy all his desires. At the time of death he would say that a certain desire remained in his heart, it could never be fulfilled. Ravana said the same thing. Napoleon and Alexander spoke similarly. Everybody said the same thing... that his desires were still unfulfilled. If anybody had said that he was content, he must have been one who had lived around himself. All those who have lived around themselves never say that any of their desires have been left incomplete. Those who are within themselves satisfy all their desires but those who think only of others are never able to satisfy their desires. May our wisdom awaken and may we understand the value of relativity.

Everything has value

I do not say "objects" or "others" are of no value.

I do not even say that circumstances are not of importance. Everything has its own importance. Both objects and behavioural patterns have their value. The present gross mode or aspect has also its own value. Even thought has its value. To recall and to think are also of value. The present is of value and so are the past and the future. If it is said that these things do not have any value then it would be false. Where meditation has its value, there even farming and bread have its value. If there were no bread or farming, then the importance of meditation itself would be lost. If there is bread, meditation is of value. Bread has its own value and meditation its own. Sometimes man gives bread too much importance and then he eats more than he can manage. Even in food man is becoming more and more independent without giving thought to whether the body benefits or not. He has forgotten the anekantic view. Sometimes he drinks too much milk, at other times he eats too many fruits. Sometimes he eats too many sweets and some other times too much bread. The tongue finds everything tasty. It also worth considering if the food eaten will benefit the body or not. Milk is tasty to the tongue but it affects the

eye. Both are related. Neither the tongue nor the eye can be dealt with as independent. They both have relative value. The tongue and the intestines are related. Man gives in to the demands of his taste buds and overeats but does not consult the intestines. This independence can be dangerous. Man listens to his taste buds but not to his energy buds. This way his entire life has become independent. This increases a certain kind of obstinacy or a lack of holistic concern.

Obstinate: Compliant

Truth is attained through an attitude bereft of obstinacy. The basis of truth lies in a compliant state and the base of untruth lies in obstinacy. Obstinacy snowballs in relation to others. It snowballs when greater importance is given to the other. There are many types of obstinacy: sectarian, obstinate links with family and society, caste and national fundamentalism. The root cause of this is obsession with others, giving others great importance. A nation blindly manufactures weapons. On asking why they did so, they say that otherwise the balance would be disrupted. And so to keep the balance they

too manufacture weapons not, as they say, for war. This kind of thinking is also based on others, i.e., it is based on the other peoples actions. This becomes one reason for obstinacy. Finding fault with others, accusing others are activities born out of paying great attention to others.

There is a story. A cowherd came to a town with his wife. The bullock cart was full of goods. He parked the cart at a street junction and began unloading the goods. The cowherd picked up a container of butter and handed it to his wife. The container fell and broke and all the butter spilled on the mud. The cowherd was livid and shouted, "How stupid you are! How much of a loss you have made me incur. Why did you not hold the container properly?"

The wife replied, "The mistake is not mine, it is yours. You never gave me the container in my hands. You left it even before I was able to hold it and are now blaming me unnecessarily."

Both began blaming each other and a fight ensued. When the other is held at fault then a fight is inevitable. They were so engrossed in the fight that they did not notice dogs gathering to lick the butter

from the ground and gradually move on to the pots of milk and buttermilk and eat that up too. Sugar and other things fell to the ground and got wasted. Without any sale the whole cart was empty.

At all times when man does not see himself but finds fault with others there is bound to be conflict, the sparks of conflict begin to fly. This conflict cannot be stopped.

This event could have followed another course: The pot of butter breaks. The cowherd says, "Oh my carelessness broke the pot." The wife would say, "No, no it is my fault. You gave me the pot of butter to hold, and I was careless and let it fall. It is not your fault." By both of them taking the blame the matter could have ended.

The same event and two descriptions. In one, man sees only the other and in the second, he sees himself. In the first instance where man looks only at others, problems are bound to arise. In the second instance where man sees himself, solutions come easily.

The ailing man never thinks that his illness is due to his own violations. He blames circumstances for it. Even to the doctor he does not tell the truth. He does not want to say that because of unhealthy eating

habits this problem came about. He talks of everything else but not the root cause. The doctor is thus not able to grasp the real factor. He guesses the diagnosis and so the treatment is not successful.

One who is straight is pure

One gains strength to accept one's faults only when he develops the perspective of anekanta. Bhagvan Mahavira said, "*Dhammo sudvassa chittayi*": Dharma stays in the pure soul. The question asked was, "Who is pure?" Bhagvan replied, "The one who is straight is pure." Lord Jesus Christ said, "A spiritual man is like a child."

Both are the same thing. To be straight is like being a child. A child is never complicated. And the complicated is never spiritual.

A question arose in my mind too. "Who is straight?" The one who is straight is the one who has the perception of anekanta. A man with a one-dimensional vision can never be straight. He is impassioned. He observes another's weaknesses, estimates the situation and makes scapegoats of people. That man is complicated. He does not have the anekantic perception.

May we become straight and adopt the anekantic point of view and estimate, for ourselves, the value of relativity. There are three principles of fate, time and effort. In the anekantic view neither of them is given value greater than the other. Each one's value is estimated truly with respect to relativity.

What is the value of the tools of meditation?

Even meditation is not given undue importance. But the tools of meditation or the means used for meditational practice are of value. Without them one cannot meditate. Without the tools of meditation, what is the point of giving meditation any importance? How will the one who has not learnt to do penance, to observe restraint in food, to do *kayotsarg* (relaxation) and other *asanas* (exercises), to control the senses and repent for purification of soul and has not undone the mental knots of the past, meditate? The one in whom humility has not developed, the attitude of dedication and helping others has not developed, the longing for reading the scriptures has not grown, the doors to knowledge have not opened, the art of giving has not been learnt, the abandonment of ego has not been practiced, the

correct and restrained use of the body, mind and speech have not been learnt but instead clings only to meditation, he will develop a closed mind. Even meditation gets caught in that closed mind. Without anekanta, meditation cannot be understood and no discussion on anekanta can be held without meditation. There is a link between meditation and anekanta. Bhagvan Mahavir gave the anekanta perception not from any text. He gave it on the basis of his experience. The one who is experienced does not have to read and it is possible that the one who reads much may not gain in experience at all. Reading alone is dangerous. As the experience-based conscious awakens, reading-based conscious becomes dormant. And as the reading-based conscious awakens, the experience-based conscious becomes dormant. All the great men of the world were least educated. Either they never got an opportunity to study or were sent out of school.

Knowledge of the limits of self

Thomas Alva Edison was a great scientist. It is recognized that he made the maximum number of

discoveries. He was studying in school. One day the teacher wrote to his guardians saying, "Your child is dull. He is not fit enough to study. Take him away from school." The child was removed from school. The same child, Edison, became one of the greatest scientists of the world. The main reason for this was that within him, experience-based conscious was aroused. He was able to transgress the limits of the self.

May we understand the limits of the self. When man goes deep into the self, then he moves into the realm of experience and when that happens, a special light bursts into being. A source is revealed from which thousands of rays of truth emerge and fill the entire being with brightness. All darkness vanishes. The one who relies solely on bookish knowledge, relies on others, gives great importance to the limits set by others and is not able to recognize the limits of his self, will always continue to fall. He can never rise above it all. He can never shed the darkness around him. His problems are never solved and get only more complicated. It astonishes me a great deal when I hear that the writer who is able to give happiness and lessons to millions, is himself unhappy. What kind of life is this that a man who

entertains millions, goes to bed as a sad man? The one who makes millions laugh is tormented by his familial or personal problems and spends his life trying to put off the embers of sorrow. What kind of life is this!

We cry with one eye and laugh with the other. This situation arises when the root of relativity is perverted. I do not say that you should give up your day-to-day life or your family or give up the gross world or that you should not make any decisions on the basis of the gross world. But it is justified to say that it is beneficial to know the transcendental along with the empirical viewpoint. To accept the relation between the two. The peel and the pulp, both are important. We should accept their link. Accept them as a whole. The fruit's pulp is differentiated only when there is a peel. If there were no peel, then which part would you call the pulp? A fruit without a peel is hard to think of. The peel cannot be rejected. The empirical aspect or the manifested aspect can also not be ignored or rejected.

Relative estimation

This is the relativity between the empirical and the transcendental. There is the relativity between self and

others. There is the relative evaluation of the self and of others. We should consider both of them. Our entire perspective of life, our journey through life should be based on both of them. In this it becomes simple to find solutions to problems. If, of the two, one is given greater importance then we have problems. Problems become complicated and they are not easy to solve.

Worldly transactions and spirituality

Acharya Pujyapad said, "The one who is dormant in the material world, awakens in the spiritual and one who is dormant in the spiritual awakens in the material." This is an anekantic perception. The one who gives great importance to worldly transactions will never be able to awaken spiritually. And the one who is awakened spiritually finds his worldly transactions becoming dormant, reducing. A man has only worldly transactions when he is not awakened towards spirituality. With the awakening of spirituality, worldly transactions become few, limited to the essentials.

A man overeats till he does not become aware of his health. When there is awareness towards health, then meals become balanced.

A man talks too much till he does not awaken towards himself. When he is awakened towards himself, then speech automatically reduces.

A man keeps thinking, thinking so much that he does not get even a second's rest. The mind is constantly engaged in positive and negative thoughts. When man becomes aware of mental health he realizes this is dangerous business. The mind should be given rest.

Till spirituality does not awaken in man he is engaged entirely in day-to-day activities. When spirituality is awakened, day-to-day activities are restricted by necessity. The rest of them get left behind.

BALANCE

The results of knowing the limits: balance

Anekanta is a philosophy, a principle through which all the universal and transitory rules of the world can be explained.

Some rules are universal. Some are changing. Some are fixed, some are not. No rule is only fixed, or only variable. Both kinds of rules go hand in hand because there is nothing on earth which has monopoly. Everything has its limits. Time has its importance but it does not have monopoly. Everything does not happen only because of time.

Effort is also of great importance but it is not the only deciding factor either. Destiny and karma play a very important role but they are not everything. Nobody has monopoly. All of them are complete within themselves and incomplete outside them. The knowledge of limits lends balance.

Balance is the bridge

This world is one of conflicting benefits, of conflicting interests and conflicting ideas. If there were not a balance everything would go topsy-turvy. The body works because there is balance in it. Two contradictory streams of energy are flowing within it. *Pran* or breath is contradictory to *apan* and vice versa. Man lives because of the balance between the two. There are many glands in the body. They have different functions to perform and yet there is a mutual understanding and balance between them. As long as there is balance, the body is fine and once this balance is lost, trouble begins.

Balance is the bridge between two opposing claims. It prevents a clash between opposites. Anekanta has clearly explained balance.

Rules: each to his own

In this world there are two principles: sentience and insentience. Insentience or the gross objects are fixed. Sentience is not fixed. Science explored the rules operating in nature and explained them. But till today science has not been able to explain sentience or consciousness. That is because it is not fixed. Today a discovery is made tomorrow it changes and accordingly so do the rules. To explore the rules of the conscious is very difficult.

A man was walking when he chanced to see many crows sitting atop a house. He described the house to himself as the house of crows. He returned the same way in the evening and found not a single crow on the house. The crows had flown off but the house had not flown off. The house is fixed, how will it fly? Crows are sentient beings, they are alive, they are not fixed, how will they remain?

Beings are not fixed, a house is fixed. If a crow desires to sit on the building he will, if he wishes to fly he will and if he wishes to sit on the branch of a tree, he will. The house is gross, fixed, it cannot fly.

The rules operating in the world of the gross and the subtle matter are not alike. The rules operating

in the world of objects and living beings are also not alike. We do not know these rules and so become imbalanced. The reason for this is ignorance of rules. The man who does not know the rules falls into an illusion. It was raining. The master told the servant, "Just check if water has entered the house from somewhere." The servant did not get up. Half asleep, he answered his master saying," Do not worry sir, the house keys are with me. Who can enter?"

This rule is valid when we are talking of opening a locked door. A key is required to open a lock. But does water have to open a door to enter? Rule valid on one cannot be valid on another. The rule operating in the gross world cannot be operative in the subtle world. We neither accept the fixed nor the variable. We cannot give acceptance to only one of them. There is the fixed and the variable in this world. Some things are fixed, some not and the balance between them ensures the success of all systems. They do not go awry. When only the fixed is held operative over an area and variable rules confront him, then man gets confused and faces an illusion. Similarly if he views all rules as variable, even then he has a problem. Man gets caught in delusion.

The sutra or aphorism of anekanta: balance

The significant sutra or aphorism of anekanta is balance. That man should not tilt in one direction. The scale of the balance should not be heavier on one side. Both the sides should be in balance. If one side represents the fixed, the other the variable then we should move ahead taking both into consideration.

Controlled: uncontrolled

Some people get confused. They say there should be no control. Everything should be free and without controls. Some say control is very essential. Everything should be controlled. Both are one-dimensional views. With such views the balance is disturbed and where there is no balance, the results are bad.

It is not good to always accept controls nor is it always good to reject controls. It is equally not good to accept or reject no controls. It is necessary to balance the two.

In the body there are two types of nervous system. One is the voluntary nervous system and the other is the involuntary nervous system.

If I wish I could move my finger and if do not wish, I could bend it. This nervous system is controlled by the mind.

The involuntary nervous system acts on its own. Mind does not have control over it. It can never happen that the mind can tell the heart whether to beat or not. Other than for those who are highly adept in meditation, the heart beat is not within the control of the mind. Under special conditions of meditations one could win control over the entire nervous system, but this is very special, not an ordinary occurrence. The ordinary occurrence is that blood flows at its own self decided pace and the heart too beats at its own will. The heart pumps out the blood. The lungs purify it. All the autonomous nerves work of their own will. The control of the mind does not operate on them either.

In our body both systems operate: one, of control and one, of no control. We exercise control over children. Every minute they have to be attended to. But when they turn 18-20 years of age, the control changes, it does not seem to be required in the same manner as before.

Control and the lack of it are both relative. Even

on growing up if the intellect and wisdom have not been awakened, then control is necessary. Once the intellect and wisdom have been awakened, controls diminish and even become non-existent. The same logic of relativity applies to the senses. It is necessary to control the senses. As long as desires are not pacified, it is necessary to control the senses. But once desires have been pacified, it is no longer necessary to exercise any control over the senses. It is not necessary to close the eyes. But when the sight is very painful then it becomes necessary to close the eyes. The tradition of *purdah* or veiling the face found its origin in the need to restrain the eyes. Today women observe *purdah* but in the time of the Ramayana, demonic men used to observe *purdah*. What is the need for a woman to observe *purdah*? The men lack control and the women have to observe *purdah*? What a strange situation! One man is ill and another takes the medicine? That person should observe *purdah* who is not able to exercise control over himself. If there is distortion in the eye then *purdah* is essential. It is possible that with respect to today's men, the demons of those days had more sense. They observed *purdah* for men not women.

Control is necessary when passions are not appeased. When passions have been appeased then there is no danger even if the eyes are open, the ears are open, anything and everything is open. No control or rule is necessary then.

In Agamic literature there is a system of the *jinkalpa* and the *sthavirkalpa*, which are some rules facing the man who begins meditational practice. The rules are many more in the beginning and fewer at the core. As the practice develops, method becomes less important and the inner being develops. The one who is in his first year of practice has many more rules to follow than the one who has been practicing for fifty years. With continuous practice, the person transcends sacred rituals. He goes beyond sacred rituals, beyond systems and rules. For him there are no rules of conduct. For him there is no outer control or rule. He is forever liberated, uncontrolled and free.

Bhagvan Mahavira said, "*Kusale pun nnao baddhe mukke*" The one who is free from all attachment is not bound by any rules nor is he free of them. There is no control over him but he is not free from discipline. He is neither bound nor free. He is not bound by

outer rules but neither is he free from self-discipline. All the seeds that cause bondage have died. All activities that caused attachment have come to an end.

For him control is not required

Neither can control always be accepted nor can the lack of it always be rejected. The one-dimensional perspective cannot be accepted.

Some people believe, "Do not control your activities. Do not control the senses. Do not quell your desires. Consume freely. Do as you wish. There will come a moment when you yourself will be free from all desires."

This sounds very pleasant for every man wishes there were no controls and that he could consume freely. But history has proven that wherever self will operates it has only resulted in the downfall of mankind. A world without rules and operating on self-will has never brought progress. Controls can be removed only in a situation when external impulses and faults are put to rest. The enemy of the outside world should not be sitting in front of you. And this is possible only when the enemy within you has been conquered and desires have been given up.

In such a situation nothing of the outside remains. How can an ignorant one adopt a wise man's profile? The matter is the same. The wise one interprets it differently and the ignorant one, differently. The event is the same, the principle is the same, but the wise one understands it in a different manner and the ignorant one in a different manner.

Awakening of wisdom: development of non-violence

There is a story. Three students were learning from a teacher. The teacher wanted to test them. He gave them each a hen made of flour and said, "Cut his neck where no one can see." The prince went. The teacher's son went. And Narada also went. The three took their flour hen and separated. The prince went to the forest and thought that nobody could see him there. He broke the neck and came home. The teacher's son thought that in the open birds would see him and so he went into the isolated space of a cave. He broke the neck and came home. Narada went far into the forest into a very desolate place. Then he went deep into a cave. In pitch darkness he thought nobody would be able to see and began to break the neck, when he stopped. He felt his soul

was watching anyway. "The teacher's orders were not to break the neck when anybody was seeing. There is no second person. But I myself am here. I can see, my soul can see. The Lord can see. The free soul is seeing." He returned with the hen.

The next day the disciples went back to their teacher. He asked, "The hen made of flour was insentient and not a sentient being. Have you all killed it?" Replied the prince," Here is the neck and here the body. I went into the forest and strangled it." The teacher's son said, "I went into a cave and strangled it. Even a bird could not see it there. I followed your instructions verbatim." Narada said, "Sir! I was not able to follow your instructions. I went into the dense forest. I walked hundreds of miles. There was no man, bird or beast. There was nobody there. I went into a dark cave where there was only darkness. I wanted to kill the hen there. It then occurred to me that even if nobody is seeing, the soul is. The lord who is all pervading is seeing. How could I find a place where the Lord was not watching? I was helpless. I came home."

The teacher praised Narada.

The man who becomes aware that the soul and

the Lord see everything, he is wise. Through this wisdom he is also able to develop non-violence. The ignorant man misuses this very same knowledge. When there is no balance, this knowledge gets misused. Use and misuse both exist.

Misuse of principle

One lady was bathing with her clothes on. Another one saw her and asked, "Sister, why are you bathing with all your clothes on? The clothes will become wet. You should not do this. Bathe alone and take off all your clothes to do so." She replied, "Oh! You do not understand. The sacred texts say that the Lord can see everything. He sees everything, everybody. How can I take off my clothes before him?

How can I be undressed before him? So being shy, I bathe with my clothes on."

When knowledge or wisdom is not awakened, then facts can be misused. If there is balance then such a situation does not arise. With balance, relativity gains and singular vision does not get footage. The two sides of the scale are in balance.

The one who has the perspective of anekanta does not take a single dimensional view of things and twist

logic like that woman. He does not mismanage his affairs with it but instead puts it to use and proves its validity like Narada. This is possible only through balance.

The unique gift of anekanta

In the explanation of the universal laws anekanta has lent balance. Even in the world of conduct and thoughts, anekanta plays an important role. Restraint and equanimity are also results of anekanta. Without the anekanta view there would be no reason for restraint. Through anekanta we accept the co-existence of opposites as a fact. Nothing in this world is without limits. Everything has its limits. There is need for equanimity. Loss and gain, both are to be accepted. It is the norm of life that if there is gain there will also be loss and if there is loss, there will also be gain. The two are not distanced, they are mutually connected and go together. Gain is linked to loss and loss to gain. The two are one. The difference is only in time or space. There is no distance between happiness and sorrow. No distance between life and death, they both go together. Sometimes one feels happy and life seems bright and sometimes one feels

sad and life seems miserable. Where is the distance between water pulleys? It is one single chain. The wheels bring in water, empty it and return. Wheels full of water and empty of water keep coming and going. They work together. Similarly joy and sorrow work together. Life and death work together. There is no second that belongs entirely to life or entirely to death. The first second of life is also the first second of death. Death is not an event that is to take place after 70-80 years. It can take place even in the first second. With the first second of birth the event of death also takes place. The one who does not die in the first second will become immortal, he will never die. The one who is not born in the first second cannot be created in the next. Every object experiences birth every second. Creation and destruction go hand in hand. One cannot find even one man who has been only praised, never condemned or always condemned and never praised. Both go together. The balance is maintained.

Loss and gain, praise and insults, life and death, all of them go together. We have a problem when we do not go along with them. If man learns to go along with them then he will be a truly spiritual person, a true follower of anekanta. This way his problems

come under his control. But man is very strange, he does not like to move along with them. He wants to move independently. He wants gain but not losses, he wants joy but not sorrow, he wants life but is not willing to accept death and he wants praise, never condemnation. He then forgets the universal rule. In this dualistic world, nothing comes alone. Everything is in pairs. Man is ignorant. He wants to break the order of anekanta and wants only a single dimension. When the world and nature have a rule, how can it be broken? And yet man makes his own only one perspective and does not want the other. Under the pressure of not wanting loss but wanting gain, not wanting insults but wanting praise, man gets bowed down to break one day.

Equanimity, restraint and balance

Anekanta has a rule: equanimity and balance. If gain is desired then be ready for loss also. If praise is desired then be ready for insults also. If you desire, then accept both or reject both. To desire one of them is foolishness. If you desire life, then desire death too. If you desire joy then desire sorrow too. If you do not want either then keep your equanimity.

It is on this basis of anekanta that you will be able to run your life. Anekanta then will be the moments in your life. There will be no problems there and you can live in peace.

In the dualistic world, one alone cannot do. It is man's nature to over emphasize one and neglect the other. This happens when he does not awaken to himself, does not know himself. As long as man does not know himself and is not awakened to his self, but is awake only to the material world and knows only the material world he cannot make this rule operative. This is one base on which equanimity and restraint can work. Once they start working the second rule becomes operative.

Comprising everything: where anekanta is not valid

All rules are relative. None of them are independent. Every rule has its limitations. No rule is all pervasive. There are limits to all of them. We give importance to religion and meditation and say problems will come under their control. This is a myth. Neither can religion contain all problems nor can they be contained by meditation. They all have certain limits to their usefulness. The problems of

wealth cannot be solved with religion. Nor can the problems of agriculture or monetary problems. That everything can be achieved with religion and meditation is an untrue belief.

We should not forget the limits. Everything has its own limits. This is anekanta's mantra or slogan. It is essential to know the limits. Meditation can solve problems but only those that fall within its ambit. Even the greatest of sages has to drink water, eat food. He has to wear clothes and at times even undergo medication. In this context I shall explain to you how Ayurved came into being?

It is a long story. Once many sages who were meditating in the lap of the Himalayas fell ill. The question was that when they were all observing restraint, practicing celibacy and meditating, why should they fall ill? The search for a reason began. Many sages met. Sage Bhardwaj was told to go Lord Indra and ask for the reason. Sage Bhardwaj went to Indra. He placed the problem before him and asked for solutions.

Nothing can be looked at from one angle and it should be recognized that meditation is not the solution to all ills. Let us understand its limits. It is

true that with meditation mental problems can be alleviated. Ailments born due to passions can be eliminated and when this happens mental diseases are also cured. When mental problems do not exist then those physical problems caused by mental problems cease to exist. But how can meditation remove all ailments? It is not possible. A mosquito bites and one gets malaria. This is not a mental problem. How can meditation remove this?

Sarva sarvakritam, asarva asarvatmakam: everything can happen due to anyone or anything or everything can happen due to one thing. Anekanta does not accept this as the truth. No one thing has the capability to do everything. Nor does everyone have the capacity to do everything and anything. It is important to know the limits.

Every meditational practice has its limits. Every work has its limits. Once we know the limits then there will be no problems.

Some people take a narrow unilateral view and question the very premise of meditation. What can you attain by sitting idle? This is a unilateral view. With this view many things become difficult. The one who does not know what meditation is, has never

experienced it, has never entered the meditative mould and has not evaluated its role, will surely find it a waste of time. And nothing more than that. But the one who has entered the meditative mould and experienced the pleasures of meditation will think in it lies the secret to a successful life. Meditation awakens all energies.

Third perspective: our own perspective

When I am explaining anekanta and presenting it as a view for life, we should be able to look at it in both ways. We should be able to look at it not only in two ways but also in a third way. The third way is our own perspective. It means do not look at the dual. There is something even beyond the dual, look at it. The one who looks at loss and gain will never be able to solve his problems. Only the one who looks beyond these two, with the third perspective, will be able to solve problems. That is balance. At this stage loss and gain settle down at a lower level. In this state the duality does not hurt, in fact they do not even mean anything. Only experience remains, the conscious remains.

Who is not afraid of death?

Every man fears death. The word itself brings goose pimples. But the one who has understood restraint, who has learnt to embrace equanimity, he will be able to save himself from the fear of death. Those who make preparations for a peaceful departure, invite death and do not fear it. They go close to death without fear. This is possible only when they transcend the boundaries of life and death and enter a third arena.

It is natural that even a dying man wishes to be alive. He has an intense desire to live. He is scared of death. But there are some people who invite death, praise it and gladly accept it.

The question that arises is how to bring about a change in the conscious? Where the limits of life and death finish, there begins the region of equanimity and restraint. In that stage, the conscious changes, the psyche is transformed.

The fruits of anekanta

From anekanta is derived balance. From anekanta one gains restraint. From anekanta is gained a balanced perspective. From this it is established that

anekanta is not just a philosophy but a manual for good life. Every aspect of spirituality, every inspiration of spirituality comes from anekanta. Without anekanta it can neither be explained nor practiced. People present a single point of view and that creates illusions. Many people get caught in them. This world has more people caught in problems and less solving them.

A king ordered the execution of a man. The man thought, "Since I am dying anyway, why should I be scared?" He fired the king left, right and center. The king could not understand anything. He asked his minister, "What is he saying?" The minister said, "Sire he is saying that the one who knows how to pardon is the one loved by God." The king said, "Oh! Is that so? Free him immediately."

Another minister was also present there. This man was jealous and did not like the first minister. He said, "Your majesty! This minister told you a lie. This man was insulting you and the minister told you that he was saying that the one who knows how to forgive is God's favourite. What lies! Utter lies!" The king replied, "I liked his lies more than your truth. Because even in his lies there is goodness but

in your truth there is aggression, jealousy."

It often happens that one man wants to put another in trouble. He does not wish the well- being of others, wants to fix him. This talk of fixing a person goes on even in the world of philosophy, conduct and behaviour. Man does not want to accept his weaknesses. He covers his weakness by presenting it as a principle and thinks nobody will know it is actually his weakness. He says that this is a very big principle and by following it all the knots will be unraveled. And man gets entangled in such talks. Such talks are sometimes pleasant to the ear also. But in actuality they are not true. Bhagvan Mahavir said, "Hurtful words, words that create anger in a person and kill someone are false even if they are true because they harm the listener. Words by themselves are neither true nor false. But if the stream of vital force that flows behind the words are not clean then they sully even truth and make it false.

To understand all these problems and to cope with them, it is necessary for us to adopt the perspective of anekanta, its resultant principles of balance and behave according to it. All those who meditate should aspire to make their vision

balanced, to make the conduct and behaviour balanced and make every action balanced. The moment all these ideas of balance manifest in the conscious, I will take that moment to be a moment of realization of the Supreme soul.

TRANSFORMATION

Transformation is eternal

Meditational practice is the practice of enlightenment. Man wants light. He never desires darkness. So he meditates for enlightenment. He wishes that the darkness within him vanishes, is erased. As light enters, darkness is chased away. It is possible for both darkness and light to exist in one's life. Both are possible. And this is possible because the universal law operating in this world is that of transformation. Just as the constant is an eternal rule, transformation is also an eternal rule.

The acceptance of anekanta: matter and mode

Anekanta has explained truth. There are two aspects of truth: substance and mode. In substance lies the root and the mode is additional. Without transformation, nothing can be named constant and without the constant nothing can be termed transformable. Transformation and the constant go hand in hand. One remains in the root and one in the flower. We see the flower not the root, which is underground. Sometimes a few people even try to uproot the root. They accept the changes and reject the root. There are yet others who accept only the root and totally reject the flower. This is a single dimensional view.

Anekanta accepts both. Both the root and the flower are valuable. Neither can be rejected.

Near the town there was a beautiful garden. A board there read, "Not allowed to pluck flowers." A boy came along and wanted to uproot the plants. The gardener saw him and came running. "Hey! What are you doing? See what is written?" he asked the boy. The boy replied coolly, "Yes I read what was written. It does not allow you to pluck flowers so I am plucking the root."

When the root is plucked away then the question of the existence of the flower does not arise. We cannot reject the root. Our life is a flower. We can see it. Life has become an unsolved riddle. There have been many attempts to explain life, but many seem to stop short after describing the flower. There are explanations that describe how to get to the flower. Any explanation that does not get to the root is an incomplete one. A flower blooms, wilts and falls off. All the while changes are taking place. It is dangerous to explain only the flower and not the root.

The basis of life: knowledge

We should understand life. What is life? It is not only that which meets the eye. At the root of life there are two operative principles: substance and mode. Knowledge is both substance and mode. Knowledge is self reliant as well as reliant on others. In its self-reliant form, there is constant endeavour of the self to learn more. When knowledge turns into two then it becomes reliant on others.

On the basis of self-reliance, knowledge can be counted as one.

In its original form knowledge is constant, but

when it is concerned with learning about changing modes, it does not remain constant.

The first aspect of our life is knowledge. The basic aspect of life is knowledge. The second aspect of life is mode. It keeps changing. Modes are not of one kind. Transformation is also not of one kind. One is a natural change that occurs normally and the other is yogic change that occurs due to external stimuli, due to associations and relations.

Nobody has control over natural transformation. It takes place in tune with nature and it can neither be stopped nor arrested. It is in the very existence of the object. In the same existence, change is also contained. Change occurs so that the object is able to retain its identity in the next moment. It is necessary for change to take place so that the object can move from one moment to another retaining its existence. If an object does not change from moment to moment, then its very existence would be at risk. It is natural that an object changes every moment. It is a voluntary change. This is the object's self-operating nervous system. The other is involuntary change which takes place due to external stimuli.

The cause of transformation: meditation

The purpose of meditation is to bring about transformation. The one who comes to meditate does so to change. If the idea of change was not there meditation would not seem so attractive. Man wants to change.

Only yesterday a gentleman said, "I get very angry. I want to change. My friend told me that if I practiced meditation then I would automatically get less angry." That is why even without invitation hundreds of people join a meditation camp. Man desires change; he does not want to remain the same always. Nobody wants to remain a child. He wants to grow into a young adult. No youngster remains young. They too become old. Just like youth has its excitement, old age too has its excitement. One who has not experienced old age and does not know the joy of being old will not know the real pleasure of being old. All the problems associated with youth, which create chaos, which harass and which arise due to the immaturity of the mind finish off when they enter the arena of old age. Does he then get to know what happiness is? What joy is? There is no joy in childhood, in youth or in old age. And yet, if we

can just get the key to happiness, there is plenty of joy in childhood, in youth and in old age. The one who has not reached old age would not know the joys that await him there. Every person can experience the joys of all ages. He can pass through every state.

Sorrow, real and unreal

We should know the principles of change. Every man wants transformation. The entire process of meditation is to bring about transformation. I have seen that people who have not been able to change for many decades have changed in one meditation workshop. Man's nature changes, his habits change. A man has many problems in his life. Anger, ego, fear and deceit are some of them. If we go closer to reality, look at the truth, then we will find that twenty-five percent of our sorrow is real and the remaining seventy-five percent is unreal, caused by our ignorance, thinking and beliefs. We suffer them. If we enter the zone of truth or get closer to truth, seventy-five percent of our sorrow would disappear. An angry man suffers himself and makes his family suffer also.

Anger is fire

In reality every man wants to change. Whether the angry man wishes it or not, his family members would definitely wish that he change for they all suffer because of him. He suffers himself and inflicts suffering on others too. Fire burns itself and burns others. Keep anything on fire and it will start boiling. Fire burns and destroys everything leaving behind only ashes. In the workshops of meditation, fifty percent of the people who come are self-inspired. Others inspire the remaining fifty percent of the people. Those who have benefited inspire them and tell them to go change. Motivated by such inspirational advice, many people come and join the workshops and even undergo change. Some people do not want change.

Yogic modes can be changed

It should be understood through anekanta that all the yogic modes, that is modes created by contacts and relations, and the different states of opinions and external stimuli, can be changed. They are modes that are within our control. We can change them if we want to and not change them if we do not

want to. This is like a voluntary nervous system. As soon as we wish to change, we change. Our body, psyche and mind changes. Our rays of consciousness changes. Our subtlest variations of consciousness changes. Our aura changes. The energy of our body changes. The chemicals and the functioning of the nervous system of our body also change. The hormones secreted by the glands also change. Everything changes if we wish it. We should get this clear that while we can play no role in interfering with the natural modes, we can change all other modes. Man thinks he cannot change. That habits can never change. This is false and ignorance impedes our development. We have taken those which are not rules to be rules. It is because of this that man does not aspire to change.

Man can fly

A priest was talking to a scientist. The scientist said, "Man can fly and in fifty years from now he will." The priest replied, "You are wrong. Only Gods can fly not men. By saying so you are insulting the Bible and other ancient saints. You are trying to prove them wrong. The development that was to

take place has taken place. All discoveries have been made. No new discoveries can be made. All doors to discovery are closed."

Such a notion evolved because the priest thought that truth was searched out only in the past and that it had been completely found and no new search was thus possible. Religion accepted this as the only truth and clung to it and so the religious world saw no further development.

You will find it surprising to hear that the same priest's sons discovered the aircraft fifty years later and flew in the sky.

Transformation is an eternal rule. All the truth that has been uncovered is but a drop in the ocean. The ocean of truth is full. With one single drop we have assumed that we have comprehended all truth; that our search has ended; that the doors have been closed. But who opened them to close them?

The desire for search is infinite

The Jains say that today the door to *moksha* or liberation is closed. Jambuswami closed the doors to liberation. Whether he did so or not, we definitely have done so. Who locked and who unlocked? Who

reached the doors and who inserted the keys? Who had the keys? Was there a watchman at the door to liberation who locked or unlocked the door as desired? Acharya Tulsi once said that the Jains have rejected the possibilities of liberation and have made the religious world like the material world. People now sit back believing that there can be no esoteric knowledge or absolute knowledge. Liberation cannot be. This belief has stultified their desire for quest.

If an ill man thinks he can never get better, then he never will. If a fire catches on and anybody thinks that it can never be quenched then it can never be quenched. Man will never make an attempt to fetch water or sand.

Due to a wrong belief, all of man's hard work, efforts come to naught. We should not be worried if the door to liberation is open or not, if it is locked or not. We should believe that even today liberation, pure knowledge and esoteric knowledge are attainable. All the possibilities are still open. The need is only for extreme effort and extreme hard work. We should not worry how far our effort will take us. But we should see to it that there is no drop in the effort put in. When man is dejected in the first

step itself then his second step is never taken. He is engulfed by many problems. Due to his ignorance, false beliefs and strange thinking man takes the wrong steps and gets caught in the vicious cycle of problems. This can happen due to fear also. He begins meditational practice but fears the future because of his accompanying remiss behaviour. Fear, ignorance, ambition are all obstacles to meditational practice. They do not let us transform. The transformation we want to undergo we are not able to effect. Undesired changes occur but not the desired ones. They get distanced.

Fear: a great destroyer

Due to fear any number of modes change.

Plague was riding a horse. On the way it met with Confucius. He asked, "Where are you going?"

Plague replied, "I am going to the town of Singai."

"What will you do?"

"I will kill people."

"How many people do you want to kill?"

"Ten thousand."

Hearing just so much Confucius moved on ahead.

A few days later Confucius was going for a walk

and he saw the same plague riding towards him. Confucius asked, "Why did you tell lies that you will kill ten-thousand people?"

Replied Plague, "No sir, I did not tell lies." Confucius retorted, "In the town of Singai fifty thousand people have died, not ten thousand." Plague replied, "I killed only ten thousand. The remaining forty thousand died out of fear. How can I be responsible for that?"

Fear is an inner mode. We have to get to know such and similar emotional modes and change them.

How to change them and what is the basic rule for doing so? How to replace those modes that act as obstacles to life and give us unhappiness with those that can give complete happiness? This question is of utmost importance.

As our natural aspects get manifested, these negative emotions dry away in the same way as our natural emotions get weaker, negative or unnatural emotions get stronger.

The aphorism of meditational practice: perceive and know

According to the anekantic perspective the basic

rule of spiritual practice or for the expression of our natural emotions is: know and see, know and see, see and know. That is spiritual practice and nothing more. It is a waste to adopt yogic postures, do *pranayama*, concentration, practicing withdrawal, closing your eyes or taking a deep breath. Do not get caught in them. They have no meaning. Is concentration also a waste? What is the use of concentration? Is a thief having less concentration or is an archer having less concentration? Does the duck have any less concentration while trying to catch a fish? While aiming a shot, does the one who shoots have less concentration? If these are associated with knowledge then they become meaningful but if associated with consumption, then they give sorrow. There are two clear lines: One is the line of knowledge or learning and the other is that of consumption. If along with consumption exercise also gets linked then that can also give pain. Man wants to do yogic exercise to keep his body healthy. He wants so much energy that he can consume more and more and yet not dissipate his energy. Are yogic exercises the rule of spiritual practice? Where is the rule of spiritual

practice? In that *pranayama* should be so effective that all that is eaten is digested? In that when seated in *yogamudra* all the extra food eaten should be digested? Man does *yogamudra* and *pranayama* motivated by such desires. Should these benefits be the basis of yogic exercises? Where is the rule of spiritual practice? This has become the rule for consumption, for pleasure.

The emperor of Greece, Nero was fond of food. When he would sit down for a meal he would keep a handful of doctors next to him. He would also keep a peacock feather with him. He would eat well and then use a peacock feather to bring it all out, to throw up. He would alternate between eating and throwing up. He would do this more than ten to twenty times a day and doctors would keep examining him.

Can medicine be a pleasurable thing? Can yogic postures and *pranayama* be the rules for spiritual practice? Is restraining the senses and the mind a rule for spiritual practice? Man observes restraint to understand that which is difficult to understand even in complete concentration. He observes restraint so that a part of the whole may be known.

There are so many types of spiritual practice in

this world. Some practice necromancy, for example. All such spiritual practices are carried out only for material prosperity.

Is mantra the rule for spiritual practice? No. Even today it is being used for material upliftment and towards selfish ends.

The secret of the rule for spiritual practice

We should reflect on every aspect with the perspective of anekanta. Meditation, thoughts, concentration, *pranayama*, restraint of the senses and passions and discipline are all rules for spiritual practice. When they are associated with knowledge they become rules for spiritual practice. When they are used to achieve learning, then they motivate spiritual practice. When they become rules for materialism then they dissuade spiritual practice. They should never be given any value.

The basic rule of spiritual practice is to know. It is never anekantic. To know for the sake of knowing alone and not towards consumption: that is the rule for spiritual practice. All that get associated with this become rules for spiritual practice. Know and perceive. Know your breath and see it. Do not react

to it. The secret of spiritual practice is to know, not to react to it, not for consumption. When man begins to use everything towards consumption, he becomes sad. But when he only knows, he does not become sad.

The lofty rule for meditation

There is one single lofty rule for both meditation and religion: know pain but do not experience it. There is pain in the body. Know that, do not experience it. The one who only knows, reduces the intensity of the ailment while the one who experiences it increases it. If there is pain somewhere, know it and you will find it reduces. When you start experiencing it, it increases. Those who know illness and see it, treat it as a guest. Poor thing has come in today to leave tomorrow. If he wants to stay longer, let him. What difference does it make? A guest is after all only a guest, not a permanent resident. He comes and goes. When man begins to experience his illness then he becomes restless and takes all kinds of medicines to treat it. He wishes to erase it within seconds.

There is fear of pain. That fear creates imbalance in the whole body. One will experience pain

commensurate with the fear in the person. It is in proportion to the unhappiness we feel, to the fear of pain that we experience, that the functioning of our systems will also be affected.

Napoleon lost the war of Waterloo. Why? Here is a secret. Doctors had examined Napoleon and reported that his pituitary glands were not functioning properly and so he could not take the right decision.

Fear gives rise to diffidence. Due to anger the glandular functions become imbalanced. They have to work much harder. Its natural intrinsic functioning gets arrested. And this is harmful.

The pituitary glands help in taking decisions. When there is too much stress on them, they get tired and take the wrong decisions. It is not just Napoleon but many Napoleons like him who have lost wars due to this. Those who wage world wars, those who fight wars, those who cause unrest and violence in society are those whose glandular functioning is imbalanced. Such people harass their glands so much due to the passions and anger within them that they become imbalanced and that makes them take the wrong decisions. Such people not only

destroy themselves but bring destruction to the whole world.

The one solution that emerges from all this is: the need to know the natural mode and the yogic modes. The cause for the manifestation of the natural mode and the key to the transformation of the yogic mode lies in being the knower and not the consumer. Only knowing, not consuming. We should know the event, not experience it. We should not get carried away by the event. The one who gets carried away will never be able to understand reality. Only the one who is standing on the shore can understand the event, not one who has been carried away by the flow. The one who gets carried away gets caught in quicksand. The one standing on the shore can understand all that is happening.

Meditation is a method of knowing. Know, know every event. It is not bad to know. Not only the good events, know the bad ones too. Not only the likeable events but also the disliked events. When knowing happens then nothing is bad or good. Nothing is liked or disliked. Like-dislike, good-bad, beautiful-ugly, these are things that happen after experiencing an event. It has no links with getting to know.

A great seeker was meditating in the forest. It was a full moon night. Moonlight was spreading herself over the entire earth. Some misled boys kidnapped and brought a girl into the forest. As soon as opportunity presented itself, the young girl escaped. The boys chased her. They reached the place where the sage was meditating. He finished meditating and the boys asked him, "Did you see a beautiful girl run past?" The sage replied, "A figure passed, I do not know whether she was beautiful or not." The boys exclaimed, "She went before you and you did not know if she was beautiful? Since when have you reached such a state?"

Replied the sage, "Since I have awakened to myself, I have been in this state. Now I am fully aware of myself. Now nobody is either beautiful or ugly to my eyes. They are all figures, reflections to me."

When is meditation successful?

When man just knows, when he is just a knower nothing is liked or disliked by him. Nothing is either beautiful or ugly. Nothing gives happiness and nothing gives unhappiness. Event remains an event, mode remains a mode and knowledge remains

knowledge. Knowledge is not a modification of an object. Nor is the nature of knowledge the object to be known. The two are different. One is that which is to be studied and the other is knowledge itself. But our doubts have merged knowledge and the object of study. Knowledge takes the form in which the object appears.

The rule of meditational practice is to change this state. To understand the respective places of the object of study and of knowledge. To let knowledge remain in the mode of knowledge and the object in the mode of the object. To not let them touch each other. And that is all the job of meditation. Only so much of transformation is required so as to maintain the role of knowledge as knowledge and the object of study as the object of study, to keep event as an event and the knower as a knower. It is not necessary to do anything more than this. Once this realization occurs then it is not necessary to meditate for two hours. When it has happened that you are able to know an event and not experience it, then meditation brings results automatically. Then whatever you do, you are meditating, walking, eating, sleeping or speaking. There is no need for silence. Silence is

restraint on not speaking all the time. Meditation is going on all the time in your life.

Our basic nature is to know, to see. This does not happen in one day. It is not possible for it to happen in one day. We should not think of the impossible as impossible. That which is not possible to do in one day should not be aspired for in that span of time.

People think that with LSD everything can be made possible. This is false and one should not live under illusions.

Do not be carried away by the event

When our awareness rises, our felicity for mindful acts (*bhavakriya*) improves, then the question of experience will not arise. Mindful action is an important rule of meditation. We should live in the present. We should know the modes of the present. We should not get caught with past and future modes. To know does not mean one does not make any effort. In reality only the man who knows takes the right decisions, makes the right effort. The man caught up with the past and the future does not make so much effort or take the right decision.

There was a businessman who heard that a loss

had occurred in business. On hearing it he became worried, sad disheartened and sat with his head in his hands. This meant the man had started experiencing the event.

Another man got to know that his business had suffered a loss. He knew it but he did not get carried away with that news. He will take the right decisions, make the right efforts and thus make his life successful.

One man had great profits in business. He got so excited that he lost his life!

Too much happiness can also give sorrow and too much sorrow can also give more sorrow.

This took place in Gujarat where a poor man bought a lottery ticket for Rs 5 and won Rs 5 lakh on it. Now the prize money had come but the official did not want to break the news to the man suddenly for he felt too much happiness might kill that man. He consulted an intelligent doctor. The doctor said he would take care. They all went to his house and asked after him. The man said, "My life is very sorrowful. Is there no let up for me ever?"

The doctor asked, "If you get ten thousand rupees from somewhere how will it be?"

"Oh come on where can that ever happen to me. If that happens I will give half of that to you."

The doctor asked, "If you get fifty thousand rupees?"

The man replied, "I will give you twenty-five thousand."

The doctor asked, "If you get one lakh rupees?"

The man replied, "I will give you fifty thousand."

The doctor asked, "If you get two lakhs rupees?"

The man replied, "I will give you one lakh."

The doctor asked, "If you get five lakhs then?"

The man replied, "I will give you two and a half."

"You will give me two and a half lakhs?" asked the doctor with such surprise that his heart failed and he died on the spot.

It is true that the man who gets carried away by the event invites sorrow. The man who meditates should know this. Even after meditation if he is not able to know this, then he should accept that his meditation has not been successful. If a man's behaviour, conduct and thoughts have not undergone change after meditation then he should know that he has not even entered the meditation chamber. Meditation begins to be successful only

when the behaviour, conduct, thoughts and perspectives begin to change. The foremost thing that happens is that experience takes a back seat and knowing takes the place of importance.

OPTIMISTIC PERSPECTIVE

Two sides

The chariot of time moves at an unrestrained pace. It has two sides, day and night. The chariot of life is also moving. It has two cycles: hope and despair. Day is full of light and night is dark. Hope is light and despair is pitch dark. According to western philosophers Indian philosophy is one of despair. It sees only sorrow, sorrow and more sorrow. Birth is sorrowful, death is sorrowful, disease is sorrowful and old age is sorrowful. Everywhere there is only sorrow and more sorrow. Man is afraid of sorrow and

adopting the perspective of despair looks for such manifestations. To observe restraint, non-possession and renunciation...all these are aspects of the perspective of despair. The perspective of hope would concentrate on aggrandizing material wealth, making life comfortable and increasing prosperity and assets. The one who follows such a philosophy would not give importance to giving away or renunciation. This philosophy would advocate the construction of new things, development along new lines, creation of new things, progress with a new vision and always moving towards development. Its movement will be towards development and not away from it. Indian philosophy has deliberated upon the merits of renunciation. The result is that it has remained poor. Indian philosophy has deliberated on the merits of non-violence. The result is that we have been left behind in our race of materialism. History says that when terrorists fought with rifles, Indians fought with swords. When wars were fought with bigger guns, Indian fought with rifles. They could not progress. There was no progress because their life philosophy is based on non-violence, renunciation and restraint. They could not develop. No development of possessions, no development of

property and no development of materialism. They have all been left behind.

Why no attention towards material development

In parts this is true. But we should not look at this as a fault. Indian tradition did not pay as much attention to material development as contemporary man would have liked. Why? We have to reflect on this more seriously.

The history of Indian development is very ancient. At one time the people of India had reached a very high stage of cultural and all round development. After reaching there, they felt the roads ahead were closed.

The one who has reached the peak cannot go much further. If one is in the valley or half way up, there is a road ahead. At the peak one is left with two alternatives: either to keep standing there or to come back, downhill. Nobody can stay at the peak for long; it is inevitable that he comes down.

The Indian people had reached the pinnacle of development, culture and civilization. When on going there they found the roads ahead closed, they decided they had to look for newer routes, newer

solutions. One finding was certain that at the end of the race for materialism there were no gains. Initially they thought that reaching the peak would definitely get them something. But on going there and finding nothing they wondered how long they could continue to stand there. There was nothing so attractive to make them stand there forever. They thought of going down, but they did not accept that idea and instead chose a second route. Contemporary philosophers refer to this second route as the viewpoint of despair.

We cannot agree with this thinking. If moving towards materialism is the viewpoint of hope then we should accept that there is no right for us to expect a peaceful life.

Two routes

There are two routes. One route is that of comfort and the other of peace. One is within limits and the other is infinite. Nobody can travel infinitely in material development. But towards peace man can travel infinitely. He can go on that path till eternity. He will never face the need to move away or turn back.

The Indian people chose the second route or the one of peace. It is definite that a poor man cannot choose the best path. A poor man cannot choose the path of restraint and renunciation. When poverty itself cannot be eradicated then how can man talk of big things? Only the man who has reached the peak of prosperity and wealth can talk of them. When after reaching there he finds nothing meaningful then he looks for another route. One cannot expect this from a poor man.

Today's Indian has once again become poor. If today we hope that he will have high moral values, will be honest, will be spiritual, will be logical, then we are wrong in wishing so. In this possibility there are many problems. These difficulties are not so for those who have reached the pinnacle of prosperity.

As quickly as a westerner can become spiritual, gets drawn towards meditation, an Indian does not. The reason is very simple. The westerners have understood the world of materialism. They have been ruled by consumerism and have touched its peak and there they have realized that the road ahead is closed. This is the reason why they get drawn very easily into spirituality and choose a new path. How

can a man who is still engaged with trifles talk of bigger things?

Ma Appenna lumpaha bahum (Do not lose more for less)

An important sutra or rule for spiritual practice given by Mahavir is *Ma Appenna lumpaha bahum.* For little do not lose a lot. This has become the most important moral of Indian philosophy. Kalidas has used this in his poetic compositions. A question was asked: "Who is a pundit (a learned man)?" The answer was that a man who does not lose more for less is the learned one.

A king went to a sage. He heard of the sage's fame. He went near and bowed. As he came close he saw the sage was truly a great seeker and impressed him a lot. Folding his hands in humility the king asked, "Praise be to you my lord. Praise be to your restraint and renunciation. Praise be to your penance. What a big sacrifice you have made! You have left your house, left your family and given up all your wealth. What a big sacrifice you have made." The king went on this way. The sage replied, "O King! Do not waste the words of praise. Am I the one who has renounced or is it you? Is my sacrifice bigger or yours?" The

king was perplexed. "Sacrifice and me? I am enjoying such honour, property and happiness. I am continuously enjoying the prosperity of the material world. Where is my sacrifice? What is my sacrifice?"

Replied the sage, "What I said is true. Your sacrifice is greater than mine. Listen to the reason. Before me is the bliss of emancipation. Great bliss. The only bliss. For this great happiness I gave up a small house, my family and a little wealth. But you are a great one who has sacrificed the pleasure of the Lord and are caught in the web of small happiness. Now tell me who has left or renounced greater bliss, you or me? Tell me who has sacrificed more, you or I?"

The two paths are very clear. The first is to give up a lot for little and the second is to give up little for a lot.

Materialism, that is even today called the hopeful perspective, involves giving up more for little. To sacrifice lots and gain little.

The second path is that of peace where you give up little for lots. It is to leave little and set off on the road to peace to gain more.

The route to peace is not one of despair.

The route to peace can never be the route of

despair. This is indeed not the route to despair. This is the route of hope and man enters it with infinite hope, with the hope of reaching the ultimate, the *Parmatma.* This is not a small hope or feeling. This is a very major hope of becoming a *Parmatma.* If somebody says he wants to become Acharya Tulsi then it will sound like he is an egotist. If someone wishes to become the king, Prime Minister or minister then it will seem like he is thinking like an egotist or yearning for power. If someone wishes to be a *parmatma* then there would be no objection, it does not harm anybody. Nobody will say that he is an egotist or an ambitious person. To become a *parmatma* is no mean task and in aspiring for it there is no objection. The ambition of reaching a small post is fraught with dangers, many problems are born. If you aspire to be Prime Minister then the one who is occupying the post currently will want to put an end to the aspirant because he will view him as an opponent. All posts come with conflict and oppositions. Those in small posts are always wary of others grabbing their posts. But the post of the *paramatma* is very large, expansive. Anybody who wants this post can aspire

for it without creating any objection, jealousy or conflict.

The path to become the *Parmatma* is very clear. It is such a large pathway that all the small paths get contained in it. End in it. It is infinite and the travel along it is also infinite. Is this perspective one of despair? Never. How can we accept this as one? It is a very very optimistic viewpoint.

Acharya Umasvati was the author of Tatvartha sutra, and a well-known writer and preacher. A disciple came to him and said, "Sir what is the truth in this world that is not bound but is freely accessible to all?" He replied, "Happiness." The disciple asked, "What kind of happiness?" The Acharya replied, "The happiness of moksha or liberation." Asked the disciple, "Sir, how can this happiness be attained?" The Acharya said, "The single solution to that is to follow right thinking (*samyakdarshan*), right knowledge (*samyakgyan*) and right conduct (*samyak charitra*)."

This solution does not endanger anybody. This great bliss does not endanger anybody. This infinite happiness, this unfettered bliss, this path to peace can never be called the path of despair. This is a path

of great hope, a hope that is infinite. It is infinite and turns into the infinite itself. It never ends.

The path of spirituality, the path of meditation can never be seen as the path of despair. The desperate do not come to this path but only those come, who are satiated with the materialistic path. They then find peace. They set out in search of this path. Only they have tread this path who have become so disturbed with consumerism that even the sandalwood paste was not able to cool them or bring them any peace. Such a great fire was burning that even the waters of the ocean could not quench it. In such a state they searched for a new route. This is a perspective of great hope, not of despair.

The path of meditation is difficult

The path of meditation is difficult. It is sure that a despairing man cannot join this path and a lazy man cannot be successful in it. It requires a lot of effort, will and courage. It is wrong to think that closing the eyes and sitting down to meditate is laziness. The courage required to meditate is much more than that required for farming. A man is tilling his land. He goes about it happily, singing

or as the modern day farmer does, carrying with him a transistor. He sings and listens to music. In tilling and sowing a lot of effort is not required. But the man who meditates requires more effort. It is not an easy sweet little task. It is our very life's success. The politician makes false promises, but the one who meditates is not able to do any such thing. He says only that which can be done.

One man told his friend, "That man speaks very sweetly and it is a pleasure to listen to him but all of it is false. They are meaningless." Those who talk sweetly but with no meaning are just being politically right.

The path to meditation is not a sweet path. It is not a path of meaningless words. The words of meditation are bitter but they are useful. That is why people call it the path of despair. The path to meditation is the path to a peaceful life and peace of mind. A peaceful life and mind do not come from wealth or prosperity. There is no alternative to this peace. It's only way is through mental concentration, steadying the mind and to change the functioning of the glandular systems. This way the thoughts and waves that come to the mind are assuaged.

Thoughts and waves create opposing actions, restlessness. To negate this path is the best way to peace.

Body-speech-mind and food

One truth acquires two sides, two languages and two types of thoughts. If we look at it from the anekantic perspective two truths emerge. In meditation, the body, the speech and the mind are first needed. Then comes the need for food that controls them.

In Indian philosophy a lot has been said about the body. It is perishable. Do not do anything about the body and it can be a despairing perspective. A man may think now that we have the body let us enjoy it to the hilt. Eat a lot, enjoy the spoils of life and relish it. Now we have hardly seen anything. Then how can you say that one must give up the body, not pamper the body, do *kayotsarg*, do *vyutsarg* and refrain from food that is not digestible? Those who think otherwise say and think as follows: Why were we born? If we should not eat or drink then why were these things created at all?

Two viewpoints regarding the body

Bhagvan Mahavir has said, "*Imam shariram anniccam*" that this body is not eternal.

This is one viewpoint. There is also another. The one who thinks on the path of anekanta will not accept any one viewpoint. The second viewpoint is:

Sariramahu navati jivo vuchchayi naavio
Sansaro onnvo vutto jam tarnti mahesino

In other words, the body is like a boat. Till we do not cross the shores we cannot let go of the body. And we should not leave it. Use the body like a boat. You have to cross the shores and use the body to do so. The soul should be the navigator and the body the boat. Use the body in the right manner.

The necessity of food

To keep the body going, food is necessary. Many people think Jain philosophy gives more importance to penance. It lays greater emphasis on fasting. This is also a single dimensional view. To keep the body going food is very necessary.

The Jain Acharyas have very beautifully described this. For the monk it was said that if he has to do

penance, let him do it on an empty stomach. Why do they have to eat? If without food life cannot go on let them eat some dried thing. Why should they have milk and butter? Acharya replied saying, "Without grease in the food, life does not go on. Even if life goes on, the mind, the intellect and the memory do not work. Strength does not add on. Those who do not want to live the life of a learned man do not need to eat food with a certain amount of fat. Bhagvan Mahavir used to perform a lot of penance. In those days of penance, his body had dried up. Life had become monotonous. Writers say that after Bhagvan Mahavir started eating well, there was radiance in his body.

The reason for radiance and intellectual development

The radiance of the body and intellectual development is closely related to food. Acharya presented many scientific facts in his essay. He wrote: "In the areas where the food is sticky with oil content, people live a long life. In the areas where the food is rich, people live very long. Those people who eat moist and tasty food live very long. Those who do not get such food face untimely death."

Our attitude towards food must be balanced. Those who eat dry food are prone to anger. Their nature becomes irritable. If along with dry food there is some oily tasty food then life goes on well. On every thing we have to reflect from the anekantic perspective. We should not accept anything from a single point of view. If the body has to be left, the body has also to be used as a vehicle. If food has to be given up, it has also to be eaten. If dry food is taken then along with it some oily tasty food should also be taken. Both should go together. If both the wheels go together only then does the chariot move. The chariot does not move on a single wheel. So a follower of anekanta can never give up balance in perspectives.

Bhagvan Mahavir was standing in the posture of meditation. A long time passed. He thought, "It seems that now my body will no longer give me support. I have to finish, break my penance, finish it."

It is important to eat and give up food

From this we have got a new perspective. To make the body flawless, it is important to eschew food that acts as a deterrent to meditation. And yet to

meditate, the body needs food. If somebody is ill and he is told to stop eating...allopathic doctors do not believe in fasting but a naturopath may tell the man to stop eating. He will also tell him to take enema. Remove the dirt collected in the body, keep removing. It should also be known that stopping food is not the only thing. We should know when how and with what to begin it again. It should be constantly monitored that the person's energy is not weakened. Energy comes from food.

It is necessary to balance both sides. The body, mind, speech and food have two sides and a balance should be maintained between them.

To imbibe right

We should understand the meaning of meditation in a holistic fashion. To imbibe the meaning of spiritual practice and spirituality in the right manner. Sometimes when the vision is not clear then the meaning turns chaotic. When the vision is clear the meaning becomes useful. These facts should be clear to us.

An event took place. An officer of a factory thought, "The labourers do not work well. There should be some *sutra* that can inspire them from

within to do their respective work well and with dedication. One idea came to him. He wrote it down as a motivating principle on a board and hung it at a visible place. The principle was "*kal kare so aaj kar*" or "do today what you would, tomorrow." The labourers read it and were inspired. The first thing to happen was that the cashier ran away with Rs 10,000 the very next day. A big search was launched and he was caught. The employer asked, "You cheated me so?" The cashier replied, "How have I cheated you? Your principle inspired me to do what I did. I would have put it off for a later date but since you told me to do it en suite, I did not leave anything for the following day."

The purity of the nervous and glandular systems

Sometimes things just go awry. Those who do not have a clear vision or understanding are able to misinterpret even the best principle. Till the person's neurological systems are not working smoothly he or she is not able to meditate. In Yoga it has been given great importance that the practitioner must first cleanse his neurological system. If the nervous system is pure then the intuition accruing thereof is

pure. The more fine and refined the strings of intuition and karma are, the more powerful they become. There is an even more important thing about the glandular system. The purity of our glandular system determines the purity of our thoughts and reduces the passions and anger within us. Now the nervous system gets the second place and the glandular system gets the first place. Science has made it well known that all our emotional stress is due to our endocrinal glands. If we look at the same thing from the angle of karma then we find that the nature of the essence of and ripeness of the karma will determine its manifestation in man. If through meditation one can change the secretions of the glandular system or the karmic fruition then man begins to change and his perspective begins to change. When perspective changes then things become more meaningful.

The dance group was showing off its talent. One dancer got tired with too much of dancing and yet nobody had offered any money as appreciation. She told her husband, "The night is coming to a close. We have not got anything from the king or from the audience. The bowl for donations is still empty. Tell

me some way to fill it to the brim. Now I am totally tired." Then the husband said, "*Ma pramadi nishatyaye*...the night is closing, the sun is about to rise. Do not stop dancing, continue."

The phrase, *Ma pramadi nishatyaye* worked wonders. Its meaning brought success. The prince dropped his necklace into the bowl. Even the princess gave her necklace. A monk dropped his valuable *navrattna kambal*[1] into the bowl. The king was amazed; he just did not understand what was happening.

He asked the prince, "How did you give such an expensive necklace to the dancer?"

The prince replied, "Sir, there is a big secret here. Let me tell you the truth. It has been coming to me again and again that now the king is old and if he dies I would be king. Sometimes it also struck me to kill my father, the king and become king myself. But just now the dancer said the night has gone past and but a few hours are left for dawn, why do you think as you do? That changed my entire perspective. I thought I have sinned. He is my teacher. He has cleared my thinking. Against this, the necklace is of meager value."

The princess said, "I have grown. I have entered my youth and still you have made no attempts to get me married. I thought let me run away with some man taking with me some wealth. But the words of the dancer opened my eyes. I heard him say, there is but little time left now. Most of it has gone past. I got perspective and I was saved. More valuable than the necklace is this state of mine."

The king asked the monk, "Why did you give your valuable blanket. The prince wished for the throne, the princess for marriage, what is your desire?" The monk replied, "I was getting tired of meditating. I thought I had attained nothing and so was planning to go back home. The desire for my family got awakened. I was biding time when I heard the phrase, *Ma pramadi nishatyaye.* And I thought fifty years of my life have gone past and why should I destroy everything in the few remaining years. Now it is dawning time. I felt greatly indebted to the dancer. He gave me a helping hand and stopped me from losing my restraint. Against this act of kindness, my blanket is of little value."

Kal kare so aaj kar, do today what you would tomorrow and *ma pramadi nishtyaye*, do not stop

for it is about to dawn are both *sutras* that inspire.

Many sayings pale when they encounter anekanta. Both are true: if our vision is clear then meditation gains in meaning and is successful in awakening our inner conscious. The one who does not have a clear vision, does not practice penance, does not meditate or live a life of restraint follows a philosophy of despair.

Two limits of knowledge

There are two limits of knowledge, one is the limit set by the intellect and the other is that set by experience. The comprehensive way to meditation and penance is experience. This not an intellectual path. So if the intellectuals argue against it, it is not surprising. The job of the intellect is to argue. Those who practice meditation and restraint do not use only logic and intellect as the touchstone. That is not their path. Their pathway is paved with experience and so their touchstone will naturally be different. The one who has used experience itself as the touchstone and tasted the sweetness of experience will know there can be no other superior route. This is not just a path, it is the only supreme

path. This is not a despairing but a highly optimistic perspective. It is possible that one who uses his intellect as the touchstone may find this perspective pessimistic. We should not take offence or be surprised. Logic has its own path, which can become complicated but the path of experience is different.

A head clerk told the other clerks, "During office hours you go for a shave and that takes a long time. Do not take your shave during office hours." One clerk replied, "When the hair can grow during office hours, they can be cut also at that time. If you find a way of stopping hair growth during office hours, we will also not cut it during office hours."

This is the language of logic, not of the intellect. Those who live within the limits of the intellect and logic speak this language.

Three limits

There are three limits. One is that set by the consciousness of the senses. The other is set by the consciousness of the mind. The third is set by the consciousness of the intellect. We have experienced the limits of all these three. Till experience does not enter the limits of the conscious, everything seems

as above. This is definite that the one who has not experienced meditation cannot enter the limits of experience. His entry is barred.

The success of practice

Those who have sat down for meditation for the first time say after ten days that they could never have imagined that such an experience was possible. When there was no question of imagination, how could they have imagined? How can a man standing at a distance imagine? It is not the subject for imagination. The one who has not dipped into himself, who has not tried himself, how can he imagine the benefits or results of meditation? How can a man sitting on the shores of an ocean estimate its depth? Only the one who has dived into the ocean can describe its depths. We know our outer self, not our inner self. Many people spend their lives knowing just their outer self. They never get an opportunity to go within. Are they able to see all that is within? No they are not. They do not know what lies within. Only the one who goes deep into meditation, takes long dips in spirituality, knows the principles operating within. Many of those who

see the body get scared on seeing its vibrations. Where have they come from? Are they something new? No they are not new. They were all within. They are constantly working. The energy of the body is also working. But as we concentrate we get to know of them and man gets scared. He feels the whole body is trembling. Some new world is facing him. The vibrations were on even earlier but their sound never reached the ears. As soon as the ears stopped hearing outside noises, these sounds became louder and audible. As soon as the mind got more stabilized, the inner self emerged clearer. Man gets worried when encountering the strange world within. We are well acquainted with the outer world, but not with the inner. The only purpose of meditation is to introduce the one who meditates to his inner world.

Our interaction with the outside world should lessen and that with the inner world should increase. We should be less obsessed with the other person and more with our selves. If this happens there will be major changes in our consciousness and a change of personality will take place. If the transformation were to continue then we could reach the final point. The personality should constantly change. Our

perspective should become more and more gentle and the perspective of anekanta should always be with us. May we not be caught in passions. May we not think in a single dimensional fashion and be fanatic about any one thing but instead may we adopt a balanced, relative and mutually connected perspective with equanimity, taking into consideration every possible alternative view.

Spirituality's greatest result is a holistic view of life. This cannot be got without spirituality. As we progress in spirituality the seed of our anekantic perception grows into a huge tree and its life fragrance emanates from all four sides.

Notes

1. *Navrattna kambal* is an expensive blanket which is said to have been made in Nepal and was believed to have been studded with gems.

Anekanta, The Third Eye is Acharya Mahaprajna's profoundly eloquent exposition of Mahavira's teachings. Acharya Mahaprajna the spiritual seer, who comes in the tradition of Acharya Bhikshu and Acharya Tulsi, reveals the essence of Jainism to truth-seekers in this book. He discusses the metaphysical concept of anekanta in terms of its practical application. He relates elegant stories to highlight the role of anekanta in understanding fundamental concepts like co-existence, equanimity, balance and optimistic perception.

Rs. 195 **ISBN 81-901458-0-0**